DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 735 IR 005 531

TITLE	Library User Access: The Other Side of the Coin.
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	May 77
NOTE	137p.; Minutes of the Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (90th, San Diego, California, May 5-6, 1977)
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; *Library Associations; Library Circulation; Library Instruction; *Library Services; Meetings; Special Libraries; University Libraries

ABSTRACT

Aspects of library accessibility to users were discussed at this meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). Presentations by the nine speakers are reproduced in this report: (1) Richard Boss, Princeton University Library, "Overview"; (2) Hugh Atkinson, University of Illinois Library, "Decentralized Circulation"; (3) Richard DeGennaro, University of Pennsylvania Library, "Duplication and Replacement"; (4) Richard Dougherty, University of California Library, Berkeley, "Documents Delivery"; (5) James Skipper, Research Libraries Group, "Interlibrary Loan"; (6) Francis Spreitzer, University of Southern California, "Microforms"; (7) Anne W. LeClercq, "Non-Print"; (8) Virginia Sherwood, University of California, San Diego, "Library Instruction"; and (9) Dr. Mark Curtis, "Library Users Weren't Born That Way" (Keynote Address). The minutes of the ARL business meeting are included. Appendices contain lists of ARL officers, members of the Board of Directors, ARL committes and task forces, organizational members of ARL, and the auditor's report. (JAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149735

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

LIBRARY USER ACCESS: THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN

Minutes of the
Nineteth
Meeting

May 5-6, 1977
San Diego, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Suzanne Frankie

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

IR005 531

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

	Page
Opening	1
OVERVIEW Richard Boss	2
DECENTRALIZED CIRCULATION Hugh Atkinson	5
DUPLICATION AND REPLACEMENT Richard De Gennaro	14
DOCUMENTS DELIVERY Richard Dougherty	22
INTERLIBRARY LOAN James Skipper	34
MICROFORMS Francis Spreitzer	40
NON-PRINT Anne W. LeClercq	45
LIBRARY INSTRUCTION Virginia Sherwood	53
Speakers Panel	60
LIBRARY USERS WEREN'T BORN THAT WAY (Keynote Address) Dr. Mark Curtis	67
BUSINESS MEETING	74
Amendment to the ARL By Laws	74
Report of the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books	75
Report of the Task Force on National Library Network Development	77
Report of the Executive Director	78
Report of the Office of Management Studies	87
Closing Remarks	89

Page

APPENDICES

A. Bylaws of the Association of Research Libraries
As Amended May 6, 1977 90

B. Association of Research Libraries Task Force
on the Requirements of National Library
Network Development: Background and Issues 99

C. Attendance at 90th Membership Meeting 104

D. Officers, Board of Directors, Committees,
and Task Forces of the Association 111

E. Membership of the Association of Research Libraries 115

F. Auditor's Report 121

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 90th Meeting

Edward C. Lathem, presiding

The Ninetieth Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Vacation Village Hotel in San Diego, California, May 5-6, 1977.

President Edward Lathem opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

President Lathem then discussed the theme of the program: "Library User Access: The Other Side of the Coin."

C 5

OVERVIEW

Richard Boss

Introduction

PRESIDENT LATHEM: Ladies and gentlemen, many months ago it was concluded that the program for this spring meeting would concern itself with providing appropriate responsiveness to user needs in research libraries. I remember, during the Board meeting at which this was discussed, I passed a note to Richard Boss asking if he would be willing to participate centrally in planning the May 1977 program, knowing that the subject matter represented an area of his very special interest and professional competence. I received a note back from him, which has on it one word, "Delighted."

In the period since then, Richard has vigorously, and certainly very effectively, taken on the chairmanship of the overall program he has entitled "Library User Access: The Other Side of the Coin". Richard, with very great pride and with deep regard, I present you to our colleagues for the purpose of conducting and introducing the program elements.

RICHARD BOSS: You will recall that, until the recent reorganization of ARL, there were a number of commissions. One of those was a commission on access, which very successfully concerned itself for several years with the topic of interlibrary loan. It looked at access to resources outside our own institutions. As I understand it, the Interlibrary Loan Committee was one of the creatures of this access commission's effort.

Under the leadership of Virginia Whitney, the group began to turn its attention to access to resources within our institutions. I think there is no question that we have, as a group of research libraries, developed a distinguished record in building and maintaining fine collections of materials. We have perhaps focused a little less on the question of whether people can successfully access those collections in our libraries. The access commission identified a number of obstacles to getting at those materials which we hold. Among them might be something as simple as a graphic system--or the lack of it--so that people find it difficult to find their way through the library. Or, as I remember Warren Kuhn saying several years ago, it is troublesome that the people whom one sees when one enters so many of our libraries are the security guards, the exit guards, or the library assistants checking books out at the circulation desk--not those people who are most skilled in getting people to the resources of the library.

Another problem might be the complex arrangement of our collections. I can cite our own example as one of the most

outstanding: We have no less than 50 different prefixes and suffixes designating special shelving locations for the main library alone. The list is formidable, even to an experienced library user. Still another problem may be the condition of the shelves. Maybe we are strangling on our own success, those of us that have large open-stack libraries. We did a random sampling at our institutions this past year by checking a hundred single-faced sections of stacks throughout the Firestone Library. We ascertained by the rate of error in shelving that out of two million volumes in the library, there were 132,000 volumes out of place. It was almost unbelievable. In fact, I think the people who did the survey are the only ones that did believe it. We then did a thousand sections, and found that the data was almost exactly the same.

On the basis of these results, we approached the Mellon Foundation, which underwrote an effort to systematically read the shelves, to get the collections back in proper order, and, most importantly, to study the rate at which material goes out of order in various areas of the stacks. We found, after studying our entire stacks, that the prediction derived from our sample of the first hundred sections had been very, very accurate indeed. In fact, it was accurate within a half of 1 percent. We found what we hoped to find, namely, that the rate at which things go out of order varies dramatically from one area of the stacks to another. In the case of Arabic texts, that rate is inconsequential--at least over the period we have been checking. Since we put the Arabic texts in order, the error rate has not changed at all in six months. On the other hand, the rate at which military science and fine arts go out of order is dramatic. We have to check their shelves once a month in order to maintain a 99 percent level of shelving accuracy, which is the goal we have set for ourselves. We have tried to correlate this to circulation patterns and various other things to ascertain whether we can pinpoint those areas where we ought to concentrate our resources, since the Mellon grant obviously will not go on forever. We have to meet this obligation and blend it into our operating budget. This is a very mundane topic in many ways. Not many staff members get excited about it. Yet it is so basic an element in making our users successful in finding what we have listed in our catalog.

We had great hopes when we did this project at Princeton that we would be able to take a stack which had been the subject of user complaints and now find most of its books on the shelves and in good order. We were disappointed that this was not the case, and, of course, the next logical step was to conduct an inventory to determine whether materials were missing from the collections rather than just misshelved. One of our speakers this morning will be talking about just such a project. In the course of my introduction and of his talk you will see that we will be addressing that topic.

Altogether, the access commission identified twenty different obstacles that one might seek to remove in order to assure successful access to the resources in a library. In the presentations that follow, we have picked some of these obstacles and asked someone who has worked on each particular one to talk to us about his or her program. Most of them you will find are nutsy and boltsy operations. Perhaps what is important here is not any one component. It is rather that, should we tie all of these together under a single umbrella of improving access to collections, we may make a difference in how well our users perceive they are doing in using our library facilities.

DECENTRALIZED CIRCULATION

Hugh Atkinson

Introduction

MR. BOSS: The first of the people we have asked to speak to this topic is a person who can best be characterized as a travelling salesman of bibliographic happiness. He has talked to us before and has said that the purpose of a library is making people bibliographically happy. He so successfully preached that gospel at Ohio State that he has now gone on the road to the University of Illinois. There, bibliographic happiness hopefully will be achieved by sometime early 1978. In order to give you an idea of how he proposes to go about it, we have asked Hugh Atkinson to take twenty minutes to present the Ohio State - Illinois plan.

* * *

HUGH ATKINSON: I am somewhat unsure about the topic, "The Other Side Of The Coin," so I am not certain I will speak on the subject that Richard wanted. I will talk about circulation, however. To paraphrase one of Mr. Lathem's heroes, "circulation is a small unit, but there are those that love it." I do want to speak about decentralized circulation, but we should keep in mind that I am referring to decentralized circulation with centralized circulation control. There are a lot of systems around which accomplish this--the CLSI and DEMCO systems, which are off-the-shelf models, of course the OSU system, which is used in other institutions as well. It is this kind of on-line system, searchable by various bibliographic items and providing access to a circulation file for all the units in a large system, that I think offers us some interesting possibilities.

Since you are all familiar with this kind of system, I will not describe it other than to say that it is usually accessible by title, author, title and author, and call number. To this slim basic bibliographic record, the circulation information is added, namely, who has the item and when it is due. The housekeeping routines are carried out by machine on-line, and, by and large, the reports printed offline. What we should keep in mind as we consider these systems is, first of all, that "small is beautiful" as the book says. I think that is a fact which all of us should remember as users of the library. If we want to borrow a book, I think we are all most satisfied with the responses in those libraries which have collections designed to meet the needs of a relatively homogeneous and small clientele, those libraries that have perhaps one librarian, a clerk, and a handful of students. That kind of library, a very small one, seems to satisfy us the most if we can find the materials we want in it. That is why the collection in such cases is so important. Because that smallness is so attractive to library users, we should build systems that are able to provide it without the concomitant disadvantages of the lack of general access which exists in manual systems.

The ability to achieve this is probably the most basic advantage offered to the user by one of those on-line accessible circulation systems.

What happens when such systems are installed, of course, is that there is a large increase in the volume of use. Something in the neighborhood of 40 percent increases over the old circulation pattern using manual systems should occur. Now, some of that, perhaps even a large amount of it, results from the fact that we are already decentralized. Most of our large libraries have gone geographic. We do have branch libraries, and, whether we like them or not--I do--they are there, and we have to live with them. Typically, this kind of fragmentation has interfered with our users' access to materials, however. When you can cut such interference down by around 40 percent, you can get something like a 40 percent increase in circulation. What we have to overcome are the difficulties that were created by decentralizing and fragmenting our libraries without accounting for the problems that diverse physical location caused for our users. When you can overcome the difficulties of dispersal and still have the convenience of decentralized collections, you have the best of both worlds.

One of the classic worries in libraries, whenever there is an increase in use, concerns the question of whether somebody else will want the book when another patron has it. That particular worry is seldom justified. But there is a problem associated with increases in circulation, and that problem is labor. The effort that goes into lending, keeping circulation records, and all the associated processes increases the cost, not determining whether two or three patrons want the same book.

We have noticed that the daily peaking, the hourly peaks of usage at the desk, seem to be smoothed out by the on-line circulation system. Perhaps the daily peaks are smoothed out over the week. But there may be an accentuated weekly or monthly buildup of use, and this can lead to some scheduling and financial problems. While most of our desk attendants are student hourly employees, we do have a fair number of clerical employees within circulation departments and they must be scheduled to accomodate the load. Another effect of automated systems is that they do not decrease browsing. If you anticipate that the traffic into the libraries is going to decrease, that will be a vain hope. It may increase with automation, at least if the system is on a campus which allows people to get to the library.

Another aspect of these systems is that they provide a uniformity of access for all varieties of patron. No longer can the law, music, and medicine libraries do their own thing and bar the rest of the campus. Now, law, being a little more clever than the rest, never says it does not allow others, it just says they cannot sit down. They can only charge out books, but, because the library is short on space, only law students can sit down. The tables in the back of the room may be empty, but no one else can sit at them. Medicine deals with the problem in a somewhat different way, and music has that hidden record collection or hides

the catalog, and it has a funny circulation policy for recordings which says only people teaching music can borrow them. They borrow them not to prepare lesson plans, but for the same reason that everybody else wants to borrow the records--to listen to them. The open access that accompanies an automated system does interfere seriously with these practices. But, basically, those are positions that are indefensible in a university setting to begin with. You cannot deny access to serious people just because they are not associated with one particular group or another within the university.

Meanwhile, there will be an enormous demand from libraries, faculty, and students to add uncataloged materials to those slim, basic records. There will be demand to add all of those funny uncataloged things, that is, the AEC documents, the ERIC microfiche, the STC items, the NTIS document collections and the like, the children's collection--the one that typically we have in that funny catalog that no one can find because it is hidden in the education library--that kind of semicataloged item which is usually accessed by means other than the regular card catalog. We have typically left these collections out because we felt the payoff did not justify the time spent cataloging them. In any case, it has been assumed that the people who used them knew the printed or special tools to get at them. With automated systems, however, you discover that more open and general access simply destroys that argument. So, there is an enormous urge to add all of the "special" collections.

Such demands are easy to respond to, by and large, because most of the indexing for them is already in machine readable form. Putting them in the catalog thus becomes a mere matter of programming. For instance, ERIC, the most heavily-used microfiche collection, is available on tape. Previously, we did not catalog this material, we simply put a card in the catalog under ERIC microfiche. The people who needed it had to go use the ERIC printed index. Because it was easy, we did put the ERIC records in, and, strangely enough, people do look at those items. So, I think we have to conclude that there may be a more general audience for specialized material than just the primary clientele for which it was produced.

Automated systems also come to substitute temporarily, and perhaps permanently, for the present cataloging systems that some of us have installed to help us get around the slowness of our full cataloging procedures. Our patrons and departmental libraries will start pushing us to get all new materials into the catalog as soon as the selection is made, and that means not only the present catalogs and brief catalogs, but the pamphlets--the things we will get around to cataloging when we have time--and also the order file. There is really very little difference to a user between a book "on order", that he cannot have but will in the future, and a book he wants now but some other patron has. In both cases there is the "Will be available in three weeks"

nonsense. It is the same.

When automated systems are used, they are in a state of constant change, or should be. The research variations that occur constantly are affecting circulation, so you have to keep changing the circulation system to reflect those changes. For example, variations in the academic calendar, such as summer sessions, affect the way classes are taught, and automated systems are probably the only ones that can handle these changes effectively. It is obvious that, in the summer, you really should be circulating books for two weeks rather than three, or for one week rather than four. We know that certain kinds of special curricula are offered in the summer, and our circulation systems should reflect those changes during the period when that kind of course is ordered. Again, we simply cannot do that with printed policies because we depend on mechanical devices to remond us and insist on the changes. This can easily be done with automated systems, however.

The usual criterion underlying circulation policy is the notion that the status of the patron determines the loan period. There are some exceptions, e.g. reference books do not circulate, undbound journals probably do not either. But, by and large, it is who you are and not what the book is that determines the loan period. However, we all agree that the content of the book ought to determine what the circulation pattern is. There have been enough dissertations in library science that have attempted to chart that kind of thing, but you cannot apply a policy of that kind without some massive electronic device. I do think the inappropriate criterion we use for circulation policy is one reason for these giant increases in borrowing (or at least in renewals) when using an automated system. I think we should look forward to circulation systems which annualize the circulation history of each books, or which use some other factors, to predict what the circulation period should be for each book, perhaps within a series of ranges. When I arrived at Illinois, I discovered there were 46 different loan periods throughout the campus. We have narrowed that to 17 for the system, but that is still a fair number of variations, and I cannot imagine having an infinite number. It would be that much worse when, in fact, we have that problem of renewals.

Even though Mr. Skipper is going to talk on interlibrary loan, I cannot resist making some remarks about what our experience has been with a large system of on-line decentralized access using central circulation control. First of all, it seems to me that an interlibrary loan system which allows the users to drive it is not going to be hierarchical, but geographical. People do not go to the best, the largest, and so forth to choose the book that they want. Rather, they go to the closest. Secondly, I think those who are designing systems, especially the large nationwide ones, should remember that there seems to be a pattern of unpredictable location and use. That is, we know that 80 percent of our use occurs on some 20 percent of our collections.

We know there are these relatively few high use items. We know all the rest are randomly scattered, just random. We also can see, by looking at interlibrary loan data, that is is impossible to predict often enough where the wanted item will be available. So, it seems to me that, even though you can say, "Well, 40 percent of the items will be at LC," a 40 percent retrieval rate in any academic library is not good enough to keep the librarian from being fired. You must do better than that. The satisfactory rate we have to provide is somewhere in the 90's not in the 40's. The systems we should be designing should be ones that satisfy at something like a 90 percent rate. The neat systems which rely on "such-and-such percent returned locally, such a percent returned at LC, and such a percent returned at various other research libraries" do not work. There may be a high enough "find" rate in all of these peculiar places because of that absolutely random scattering, but these kinds of systems have to provide for that unpredictable location.

As a final remark on interlibrary loan, we have noted that the speed of response seems to destroy the need to go to the "most likely" first. If you have fast responses, patrons are willing to try over and over again to locate a library that has their item. They will try ten and twenty times to find that location, as long as they can sit down, and if they get their responses within 10-20 seconds or so, that is, electronic speeds. When you are dealing with those electronically-based interlibrary loan systems and provide a place to sit down, you probably do not have to worry about the design of the systems.

Let us reflect on some of the problems with these automated circulation systems. The one we run into first is the fact that the collections we have built and selected are not necessarily the same as the collections that are used. For instance, home economics departments will not buy cookbooks. Cookbooks have the same symbolism for home economics departments that pencil-end daters and hair-in-a-bun do for librarianship. You cannot deal reationally with this problem. But, in fact, borrowing patterns show that cookbooks go over big. In other words there is a dislocation between that which is selected and built and that which is used, although sometimes it is due more to curricular changes than to mythology. Home economics, again, is clearly no longer interested in the books about home economics as much as it is in biochemistry, textile distribution, economics and medicine. Their use of those collections is perhaps higher than the use of their own collections (except perhaps for cookbooks). If you looked at the statistics, I believe there would be an awful demand for block transfer of materials around the campus. I doubt that it is politically possible to do this, but the demand for it is there. I do not know what to do about it. You start publicizing that kind of data, and you get all kinds of worried people on any campus: those who know the collections and know full well that they are not being used and are worried that somebody else will want them and the like.

The replacement problem is really gigantic. I hope Richard has come up with some conclusions, because I have not been able to. Manual systems do not remember which books are lost. Automated systems do remember, however, and it is embarrassing not to be able to have a quick replacement system. There is no way in the world you can explain rationally to students or faculty members why all nine copies have been stolen or are out and why they cannot have another one now. We are spending all that money on things which nobody reads, but try and buy a book quickly and get it on the shelves, and it seems to be almost impossible, given the bureaucracy we have all built and maintained.

There is another problem with circulation, that funny one I call "the old stags and equal treatment." There is that group of senior faculty--not the people on the senate or the people from engineering and business who meet at the faculty club and complain about socialism, but the people who are usually the highest paid individuals in arts and sciences departments. They are not department chairmen, and they seem to care nothing about departmental or university administration. They show up on search committees for chancellors. Their real power lies in their personal representations, that is, their real influence is in the promotion and tenure discussion in their departments. They are the ones whose approval one must have to get promoted or get tenure. They are the ones whose opinions on academic matters almost always carry, but they do stay out of the general university politics. Occassionally, if you are lucky and if your library committee is an appointed one, you get them rather than the standard senate committee. They tend to have that gracious secure view of the academic world which says that no gentleman or lady ever misuses library privileges. They are the ones who, when they discover that their junior colleagues and graduate students are the worst offenders on keeping books overdue and ignoring recall notices for a reserve, say, "well, we do think that the faculty ought to be fined for that kind of thing. There ought to be equal treatment for all. They always win when they really get down to it, but the poor old librarian has to be very careful. We happen to agree with them in those circumstances, but it can be an awful fight. They always win, but it is a bitter process.

There is another problem of this kind which the circulation system accentuates, for it increases the intensity of the age-old debates about whether journals should circulate. The only solution I see to that one is being able to give free xeroxed copies, and I cannot afford that. I know that fight will go on and rise up again. About two-thirds of the faculty will vote to circulate journals for two or three days, and a very bitter one-third cannot understand that.

There is going to be constant pressure for more departmental libraries. When an on-line decentralized system with central control

works well in one facet of library administration it creates pressure to add more departmental libraries, which is welcomed by some of us. That is one of the reasons I liked going to Illinois from Ohio State, because I went from 23 to 40 libraries.

Lastly, the squabble over the standard bibliographic record gets even stronger. Usage seems to indicate that the record should have a smaller descriptive cataloging section than the one we have established. The record should be somewhat smaller, though it should certainly include the series note, and the standard should end there. We should build subject access that is accurate, changeable, and a reasonable match with the citation, that is, not the direct citation, but the reference question, the outside reading topic, the way people who come into the library actually look for books by other than the bibliographic entry.

Those were the other sides of the coin as I see them, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

* * *

Discussion

MR. DE GENNARO (Pennsylvania): On departmental libraries, I too think that small is beautiful, but small and decentralized can also be expensive. We are going into a period now in which perhaps we cannot afford to do this. Do you really believe that we can afford this type of decentralization in the next decade or two?

MR. ATKINSON: Not in your terms, but in mine. One of the last things I said was that I think we will have to reevaluate the standard bibliographic record. I think we can afford them if we will make changes to what our patrons have told us is high on their priority list. I clearly believe that the machines will make it cheaper to do a lot of the housekeeping. That housekeeping takes place in both in the departmental library and in the central administration, but the biggest and highest payoff will be from such things as filing in catalogs, and the double system we all run of journal check-in. I think the only way to afford it is to make that a priority and to transfer staff.

MR. TALBOT (Massachusetts): I wonder if you would extend your remarks on the standard bibliographic record. What kind of evidence do you have as to the size and elements in it?

MR. ATKINSON: The evidence of watching two terminals sitting next to seven million records and watching people choose which way they want to find their materials. I have that kind of sense. I cannot define the elements, but it is clear that the author and title will be there. It is not all clear what the rest of the

card should include--date, no doubt, probably place and publisher, though perhaps not both. For much of the rest of the card, I think you ought to separate the lasting elements from the things that do not last and are used less. Mathematics as a subheading is useless. The aeroplane heading is not lasting. I think some kind of separation has to occur. I cannot extend it much more, other than to notice the enormous demand to get the title and the author and some kind of number to find the book into a system that is heavily used. I think it is going to go that direction, but it is going to go very slowly and should be done very carefully.

MR. FORTH (Penn State): We are in the middle of all of this, and we are finding only supreme indifference on the part of our faculty, including the old ones. The hostility to it is absolutely minimal compared to the problems we are having with our traditional catalogers, our standard bibliographers, the subject bibliographers, the Slavic specialist, the Latin American specialist, and that sort of thing. We have very serious doubts whether our system is going to work if these librarians have anything to say about what goes into it, and I will tell you they expect to have a great deal to say about what goes into it. We would have to have a computer storage capacity damn near equal to OCLC if they have their way.

MR. ATKINSON: Which is too slow to be used for the purposes we want.

MR. FORTH: They are quite aware of it. A good many of our people who have seen the system you established at Ohio State have come back and said that such a system would do for an institution like Penn State. In the sense that I see those two institutions as interchangeable parts, I take exception to that. But the profession does need some strong guidance on it, and it needs to quit worrying and bleeding and trying to meet the highly specialized needs of a very small part of our clientele, although here, again, the normal answer is, "Yes, but that small part is the best part." I happen not to agree with that. I do not think that is true.

MR. ATKINSON: I agree, Stuart. The monster that we built is a Dr. Frankenstein, for, in fact, it was us that told Bill Welsh to do it that way. It seems to me this is one of those cases where the sins of the children, et cetera, and it is a case where we as a profession, have failed. It is one of those technical details that we, as managers, would not deal with. Instead, we allowed the cataloging committees to build it that way.

MR. WELSH (Library of Congress): It was not a question of allowing; you created it. I recall the meeting at which we developed the MARC format. It was probably the worst example of democracy in action, because you insisted collectively that we put everything into that record. That record is now costing over three dollars to input, and we are trying to set that as a standard for the nation. Yet, there is no evidence, as yet, that that record has been fully tested. We have not determined whether all the elements that are in that record are, in fact, needed. It is time we sat down and did that.

MR. ATKINSON: I think now is not the time for recriminations, Bill. It is like the villagers that surrounded the monster, saying, "I told you so." Such statements do not stop it.

MR. WELSH: Well, it was not said in recrimination. I never indulge in that. It was a case where we did meet and attempted to develop a record that would satisfy your needs, and you may well have made the difference between the needs of Jim Skipper and Dave Sparks, and that is collectively the record that is costing a great deal. It is time we reexamined that entire question.

MR. DOUGHERTY (U.Cal., Berkeley): I have the same reservations about the cost and size of the data bases, but a number of our staff members who have more technical knowhow than I felt that the cost of storage is still continuing down. In other words storing a record which is too elaborate for the uses we need really will not be the critical point a few years from now. If we can solve the conversion costs -- the input costs -- and do this cooperatively, even though we have created a Frankenstein monster, we may learn to live with it.

MR. ATKINSON: The monster is not the catalog. It is the folk who make it tick. Have you ever tried to read Facts on File, just read it?

MR. DOUGHERTY: When I was a librarian I did.

MR. ATKINSON: Reading, not using it. That is the easiest way to test what information overload is. By putting in more data than can be used, we produce information overload in the user, just as you cannot read Facts on File.

MR. BOES (Georgia): As an old fried of Hugh's, I believe, like Hugh, that one of the essential problems of access is looking at what we mean by "bibliographic data base." There may be a need for a full bibliographic record, which would be a national record created by the Library of Congress, but the rest of us need not opt with it. One of the things that I think Hugh is also trying to say is that our in-house systems do not need to be the Library of Congress. I think the second thing is that people need access to material which is other than that which is created through ordinary printed channels. When he mentioned the ERIC files, these new systems may provide access to them where right now those people who use our libraries cannot have very good access to them. I think what he is doing is trying to demonstrate a new way for us to look at things. The one thing he has not said is what difficulties this really creates for our staff.

DUPLICATION AND REPLACEMENT

Richard De Gennaro

Introduction

MR. BOSS: When I first went to Princeton University, I was warned about that Italian down the road. I was told that he was a pragmatist who would implement almost any good idea. Since that time I have come very much to appreciate his technique and have become guilty of the heinous crime of systematically watching the University of Pennsylvania to steal good ideas. The most recent we have stolen is that of systematically checking Books for College Libraries against our collections to determine which books are missing and which ones should be duplicated because they are in heavy use. Actually, we have only begun that project, so I can't tell you whether it is going to be an eminent success. In order to find out from someone who already has done it, we asked Richard De Gennaro, Director of University of Pennsylvania Libraries, to talk to us about duplication and replacement.

* * *

RICHARD DE GENNARO: I have to confess that I feel a little uneasy and uncomfortable talking about our recent efforts to duplicate and replace books. I feel uneasy because what we are doing is very modest. It is not particularly original or imaginative, and I am sure that many of the libraries represented here are doing more and better things. The reason I am up here is that I happened to tell Richard Boss about our little project, and he asked me to be on the program. I wasn't quick enough to decline on the grounds that what I would have to say would not be of sufficient substance for an ARL meeting. I did accept, I do have a very modest contribution to the subject, and I will make it mercifully brief.

During my first few years at Pennsylvania in 1971 and 1972, the complaint I heard most frequently from students and faculty was that many of the books listed in our library catalogs were not available on the shelves. I had my early training in research libraries at the New York Public Library and at Harvard, and I was ready with a stock answer that we customarily gave in the face of such complaints. It went something like this: We are a research library, and we ordinarily buy only one copy of a book, no matter how popular it might be when it is first published. We are trying to build our research collections on a long-term basis and not to satisfy short-term needs. We would rather add a different title to the collection than duplicate a title we have. The exception to this is books that are needed for course reserves, but these are a separate collection.

As for replacing a book that is missing, or, as we euphemistically call it, "not on the shelf", we would patiently explain that it was possible this book was misplaced in the stacks and would eventually be found, or it might be returned at the end of the year by a person who had taken it out without charging it. We could not afford, we said, to replace these books until after we were more certain they were permanently gone. By that time they probably would no longer be in print anyway.

The complainers would more or less accept this explanation, or at least they would go away. But, after awhile, I began to doubt the validity of the logic I was using to answer these complaints. I also began to be concerned about the library image among its users. We were sacrificing the here-and-now needs of real users in favor of the possible future needs of researchers, and it didn't seem like a reasonable thing to do. So, we determined to mount a special effort to increase the availability of books on the shelves for current users.

The effort had several aspects to it. First, we did a cost benefit analysis and installed an electronic theft detection system, not only for the real value in cutting down losses but also for its psychological value as a public symbol of our concern about our losses. I got tired of going to library committee meetings where people would ask me about the theft problem and "Wasn't there something we could do about it?" Even if the theft detection systems didn't work at all, I think the time had come when we really had to do something to appear to respond to this problem.

Our experience with the theft detection system was curious. As I say, we did a cost benefit analysis, a really sincere effort to determine whether this was a reasonable thing to do. My very skilled Associate Director, Bernard Ford, along with Michael Sommer from the operations research department in Morton School, studied this problem very carefully and came up with an answer. If any of you are interested, they published an article in College and Research Libraries. We concluded that it would be cost-saving to install the system.

Last year we tried to redo this analysis using the same techniques to see if the system had had any effect on losses, and a curious thing happened: During the three or four years that had passed, use of the library had gone up very substantially. Well, theft of materials is a form of library use, and the more the library is used the higher the theft rate. Since our rate of use had gone up so substantially, the theft rate also went up substantially. So, if you followed this study, it would show that after we installed the theft detection system, thefts soared. It was our intent to publish that study as a follow-up in College and Research Libraries, but we are holding back now--checking the data, as they say. But, seriously, I think the

theft detection system did keep the rate of theft from rising as much as it could have.

I might say, incidentally, that the theft and mutilation of library materials is one of the most serious unrecognized problems that we have in front of us today. I think our loss rates are horrendous, and there doesn't seem to be any solution to it. The whole social compact we have in libraries like ours is predicated on the supposition that our users will be honest and respect the collections. They no longer do, and, therefore, the system is beginning to break down. But let me go on.

The second thing we did was to reinstitute the abandoned practice of reading shelves. To get maximum return on our effort, we concentrated on those classifications which were heavily used and particularly susceptible to disorder and theft. These areas included psychology, black studies, occult, and various other things that are currently in demand. But Richard has already mentioned those, so I won't spend any time on that.

The third thing we did was to greatly step up our rate of replacing the lost and missing books we became aware of through the shelf-reading and circulation processes. I was going to talk a lot more about the replacement system, but, as I went through it, it all seemed so very complicated. I would have to read you a lot of statistics, which I could not quite understand myself, and I doubted that you would understand them either. So, I'm going to pass over that and just say that we did try to mount a rather substantial replacement effort. It was tied in with our automated circulation system, but the results were not terribly fruitful. We are thus waiting to install a new on-line system, which will give us a better record-keeping system, and we then hope to improve our efforts in this area.

The fourth thing we did was begin buying duplicate or even triplicate copies of certain books we thought would be in demand. We reasoned that it would be less expensive to buy and process two copies right from the start than to buy a second copy later when the book proved to be in demand (or after it had been stolen). To complement our efforts to systematically identify and replace (or add) extra copies of books that were in demand, we used the Books for College Libraries lists which had just come out as a working tool. I will say a bit more about that after I cover one or two minor points.

In addition we considered fining the faculty in order to get them to return their books. We also tried manipulating loan periods for other users, but our automated circulation system wasn't flexible enough for this. Again, we decided to wait until we had installed our new system so that we would have a more accurate and responsive system than our present one. We are going to install a CLSI system this summer, and,

after we have had our shakedown in a year or so, we will probably move toward fining faculty and other policy changes. The new system will keep track of use by title, and we will use these statistics as a tool for duplicating titles that are heavily used.

Let me say a little more about the Books for College Libraries (BCL) project. The appearance of those volumes prompted us to undertake a large scale evaluation of the collection. A pilot study during the summer of 1975 indicated that a systematic evaluation would create a worthwhile opportunity to increase availability of high-demand items. Beginning in September, 1975, we organized a group of about twenty librarians to compare the BCL language and literature volume to our own university library collections, with the idea of acquiring what we did not own, replacing missing items, and adding copies of titles where the pattern of use seemed to justify duplication. The BCL Library Task Force has since completed the entire language and literature volume, and the psychology, general science, economics, and sociology sections are nearly completed as well.

The entire BCL project was designed to bypass as much normal routine as possible. We cut xeroxed pages from the BCL volume into columns and attached them to worksheets that allowed us to record volume numbers, the number of copies found on the shelf, other circulation listings, and the number of times the item had circulated in the past three years. All of this data helped us decide whether to reorder that title. We marked the pages for items we wished to order and xeroxed them again. Then, these xeroxed pages were sent to a jobber under a special arrangement. Many of the books we received on a special order number which diverted them from ordinary processing. After we had determined whether the book was a copy-add or a new book, as we call it, the book then entered the normal processing system.

We had some good, interesting results from that effort. In the language and literature classes, the percent of the titles that we ordered varied anywhere from 20 to 50 percent, with an average of about 35 percent. Let me say that again: As we did this comparison, we ended up ordering 35 percent of the titles that were listed in these various classes. I don't have the figures for how many were duplicates, but we found that we needed to add at least one and sometimes others. The majority of the books in the language and literature section have either been received or reported out of print, so that part of the project is over. We sent orders in the middle of January, 1977, for titles in psychology, general science, and history. The percentage there was roughly the same, about a third of the titles were ordered. So it goes.

We really have no way of evaluating the effects of the BCL project. We seem to think that we have fewer complaints about not-on-the-shelf books, but we really have no way of determining how effective the program has been. Still, it seemed like a good idea to everyone that was involved in it.

Well, these are the kinds of things that we--and many other academic research libraries--are beginning to do. Their significance is not in the size of these projects. The important thing is that the efforts themselves represent a changing attitude on the part of research libraries toward their collections and users. We are (or should be) beginning to concentrate far more of our resources on serving those users who really use the collections, that is, the undergraduate and graduate students. Probably the best kept secret in the academic library business is that the faculty--for whom we ostensibly build our research collections--are neither quantitatively nor qualitatively the most active users of these collections. Our statistics show that undergraduates account for roughly 40 percent of use, graduate students for 35 percent, and faculty for 10 percent. Outsiders, faculty from other institutions, and visiting graduates account for the other 15 percent.

With the very severe budget crunch that we are facing at Penn, which means, for example, that half of our book purchasing power has eroded away in the last five years and that 10 percent of our positions have been eliminated in the last two years (another 5 percent are projected for elimination in the next couple of years), with all of this budget pressure on us, we are simply going to have to give up many of the policies and practices that we took for granted in the Fifties and Sixties. We are going to have to spend a good deal less of our resources building research collections for the future. True, we must continue to build research collections for the future to satisfy the status and prestige needs of both our faculty and ourselves. But, at the same time, we are going to have to spend a much larger share providing the books and services which support the real and immediate instructional needs of our students and faculty.

Let me conclude by paraphrasing what a historian of science at Yale once said: He noted that 90 percent (or let's say most) of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. My guess is that most of the librarians who have ever lived are alive today and that they have all had their formative years in the last two relatively affluent decades. We are going to have to make some fundamental changes in the attitudes that we developed during this period in order to make the best use of our diminishing resources in the next couple of decades.

* * *

Discussion

MR. READY (McMaster): When Richard was talking, I was saying "yes, yes" to myself. I was especially struck by one point he made about the theft and mutilation of books being one of the best kept secrets in the trade. This is indeed an enormous problem which we prefer not to talk about even among ourselves.

Recently, in the papers, we have seen Stanford admitting to 100,000 dollars' worth of losses. Virginia Military Institute has lost $34,000, and we are doing nothing about it. I once served on a committee of library booksellers which really concerned itself with thefts. Carl Jackson was the chairman. We had 60 cases which we were actively prosecuting, and of those, only one got sufficient attention from the court for the defendant to be sent to jail. All the others escaped scot-free. But even the fellow we prosecuted successfully finished up as a book salesman, because he loved books.

We had an open-and-shut case in which we had a confession from the thief brought before the court. The evaluation was for $6,000, and the judge could barely keep his face straight. Booksellers and librarians--librarians in particular--seem unimportant to those judges. If something had been stolen from a department store, there would be immediate action. This thief was remanded until his exams were over. Otherwise, it would ruin his career. All is well, he has learned his lesson. In other words, he was caught. I think we should really try to get some reaction from the courts and the public about this terrible thing which is happening to all of us. Some of us may not even be aware of it. The fact is it is increasing enormously.

MR. DE GENNARO: I served on jury duty several months ago, and I discovered that no one ever gets punished for anything anymore, whether it is rape, murder, or robbery. Everybody gets off free, so I really don't have much hope that book thieves are going to be prosecuted.

MR. FORTH: (Penn State) To you, sir, I would like to comment that what is being said is true. But, some of us see signs of hope in the courts of the United States at least. We are beginning to turn over to local magistrates throughout the commonwealth our serious problems with fines and refusal to return books, and we are getting a very good response. One of our students, a Philadelphia man of respectable family, stole many of our books and a number from the public library. He was apprehended, the machinery to punish him was going into effect, and he stepped in front of a subway train. "Well," I was challenged by the faculty, "You did this despicable thing." My point is, yes, but we did get our books back. So did the local library.

However, our biggest problem is with faculty themselves. People who would not steal your bilifold will steal your books, and we are having a great deal of trouble getting our faculty to enforce the rules against theft. We have now gone around them to our campus police, and, when we catch anyone stealing through the detection system, the campus police handle it from there. This seems to have had some effect on the rate of our losses, but our mutilation rate is going up. People who are going to steal something cut it up before they take it out.

MR. BOSS: (Princeton) May I add something to what has been reported. At first we took the approach that, if we documented the magnitude of the problem in dollar terms, we would begin to get some response. We determined that 4.36 percent of our general stacks collections were missing, not accounted for even after we had read our shelves to make sure they were in good shape. An average of 10 percent of the collection is missing in branch libraries. We have not ascertained our annual rate of loss yet, because we have not taken two inventories which we can compare with one another--except in the case of reserve, where our loss rate is 2.1 percent a year. The replacement value of materials that are missing from the Princeton University Library is in excess of $3,000,000.

Nevertheless, we were not able to arouse the campus community. Because of this, we changed our tactices. We now emphasize not just that thefts are an economic loss to the university but that user success is directly related to the attitudes that are prevalent about ripping off material from the library. If one takes a book from the bookstore, it is considered petty larceny. If one takes it from the library, it is merely some kind of exclusive use arrangement. We have given up the economic argument, we have given up the criminal argument, and, instead, we have shifted to the argument that the success rate of all of us is being seriously affected in the worst possible way. I don't know whether this is going to work as an argument. I don't know whether any of you have been at it long enough to know whether it is at all possible to get a supportive response from the campus community.

MR. STUART-STUBBS: (British Columbia) One logical conclusion that can be drawn from the contributions we have here is: If it is so expensive to replace these books, if it is so expensive to put theft detection systems in, does it follow that we should reverse the trend and close the stacks? Then you would not have to put in theft detection systems. You would not have to worry so much about theft. You might have to increase your circulation staff, but the alternative is the $3,000,000 loss. Maybe not with the undergraduate library, but in research libraries, has anyone thought about closing the stacks?

MR. WEST: (Hawaii) Recently, we had a lot of books stolen out

at the University of Hawaii. We have finally gotten the books back, but, in the process, at least one of them was bought by a rare book librarian. In the correspondence and discussions to get the book back, we were pretty much on the defensive, because we had not notified the booksellers about the loss. At this point, I believe their code of ethics requires them to give a book back if it is proven that it was stolen. But, we were put on the defensive for not telling about it. Have any ideas been developed about working with rare booksellers on the matter of losses and thefts?

MR. READY: We send out notification to the antiquarian booksellers in Canada and Britain, and we get the books back through the antiquarian booksellers. When people offer them for sale, we begin negotiations, and we have been pretty successful. In fact, this is the only success we have had. There is a feeling of brotherhood among the faculty and students that they won't tell on each other (or they are stealing themselves), but the booksellers have been excellent, and we have a continual correspondence with them about it.

MR. SCHMIDT: (SUNY Albany) I wanted to make an observation about an experience we had that is very similar to what Richard Boss reported at Princeton. We take a random sampling inventory annually, and we divide the random samples into two samples: imprints less than two years old, and imprints more than two years old. We are finding a not-on-shelf rate of 9.2 percent for imprints less than two years old, and a not-on-shelf rate of 7.3 percent for the older books. The communication of this kind of data to the community, akin to the kinds of things that Richard Boss reported, outlines the magnitude of the problem.

About the gendarmes running around, we don't particularly want history repeated. Most of us in this room can remember the episode of John Charlton in Elizabeth, New Jersey, also Harold Roth in 1961. Among other things, our poet Charity was fond of saying "What better thing to steal than a book? After all, it represents an idea."

MR. FORTH: I don't want to leave the impression that we have a lobby full of police in our library. What we do is done rather nicely, as a matter of fact. But we have set up throughout our system a series of really frightening exhibits on mutilation, containing mutilated microforms, books, and journals. This has attracted a great deal of attention from the student body. A number of the faculty are proposing--on their own, though obviously with my blessing--that we have some kind of a seminar on this whole problem through the student academic assembly. We are doing what someone here mentioned, stressing that it is not the money, it is not anything except that you are screwing one another. That seems to be hitting a responsive chord. We hope it will have some benefits.

DOCUMENTS DELIVERY

Richard Dougherty

Introduction

MR. BOSS: When I was at the University of Utah a number of years ago, I recall hearing about somebody over on the other side of the mountain in Boulder, Colorado, actually taking telephone calls from faculty members and delivering library materials to them. It seemed like a rather wild idea at the time. It seemed a rather costly idea, but then they always did have more money on that side of the mountain. Nevertheless, we went to Boulder to take a look, and it was only a few months later that we, too, began delivering documents. In my own mind, the value of that service is best illustrated by the fact that, after going to Boulder, we undertook a similar effort. However, the person from whom that idea was copied has gone on to bigger and better things. Not content with single campus systems, he is now working on one that involves a much larger area. Of course, you know that Richard Dougherty of the University of California at Berkeley has not only instituted a documents delivery service there, he is also helping to develop linkages with the Stanford University Library. We have asked Richard if he would describe that program in some detail for us this morning. • • •

RICHARD DOUGHERTY: Network planners are beginning to urge librarians to improve their document delivery systems. There seems to be a general recognition that the capacity and performance of delivery systems must be improved if libraries are to take full advantage of a national communications network. Most current document delivery modes are already overburdened, and it is unlikely that most could absorb significantly greater volume. Public libraries, which have traditionally paid more attention to document delivery systems, have gained a great deal of experience since the advent of LSCA funding. Academic librarians, on the other hand, have been almost totally dependent on interlibrary loan procedures to transport materials. Sweeping changes may be in the offing.

Although the term "document delivery" is readily understandable, it may infer different concepts to different people. To some, it is synonymous with the traditional interlibrary loan functions. To others, document delivery is more synonymous with systems such as those developed at the National Library of Medicine or at the British National Lending Library.

Up to now, most attempts to improve document delivery have concentrated on the movement of materials between institutions. No doubt these efforts will continue to receive attention. But

it is also clear that, if academic libraries are to utilize computer-based bibliographic networks, they must improve their capacity to deliver materials to local constituencies, both from their own collections and from the collections of other institutions.

Academic libraries are in a period of transition. While the traditional emphasis on resource accumulation, the sine qua non of research libraries, will remain central, it will nevertheless begin giving way to resource utilization. This shift is already reflected in the RLG project and the University of California, Berkeley/Stanford Library Cooperative projects.[1] Both undertakings place great stress on resource sharing, but this greater attention to resource sharing has created a dilemma for many academic librarians. For, even as research libraries are being encouraged to share resources, the faculty of these same institutions expect their libraries to acquire and organize collections of sufficient richness to support graduate research programs at the campus. Unfortunately, administrators may misinterpret these collection development activities aimed at satisfying the faculty. They can view these efforts as further evidence that librarians are continuing to pursue self-sufficiency, even though they, as well as most librarians, recognize the relative illogic of pursuing self-sufficiency for its own sake. Librarians have been warned that their seeming capacity to absorb resources like a "bottomless pit" has created a sense of wariness among many administrators. Mr. De Gennaro has stressed that libraries cannot continue to maintain comprehensive research collections in the old image of Yale and Harvard. Why? "Our institutions do not have the money, and our society cannot or will not provide it."[2] Nonetheless, faculty often expect--and may even demand--that library resources be located close at hand, even though they might not actually need them for years. Administrators question book budgets requested to develop research collections; yet administrators often point with public pride to their institutions' multi-million volume collections. Librarians recognize that quantity is not necessarily correlated with quality, but existing reward structures place heavy emphasis on quantitative factors. It is the reward structures that need to be changed, and, imperceptibly, this may be starting to occur. In the meantime, academic librarians are caught on the horns of a dilemma--damned if they do and damned if they don't.

Daniel Gore has proposed an alternative academic library model, which has been termed the "no growth" library.[3] Gore believes a no growth model would permit libraries to cut costs while improving services by enabling the library to provide readers with a higher percentage of books on demand. Librarians and academic administrators may disagree, or tend to discount Gore's view of libraries, but they must recognize that the essence of his proposals is gaining support among those responsible for funding research libraries. In a similar vein, Michael

Buckland has shown that book availability can be improved if a library consciously purchases multiple copies of titles in high demand, when the system is linked to a scheme of variable loan periods. At the same time, if a research library were to adopt the "no growth" model, an unmitigated disaster would occur in short order. Neither extreme--neither the Harvard or the Yale model nor the "no growth" model seems viable. The research library model of the 1980's is more likely to function very much like its predecessor of the 70's. Only its growth rate may be more modest.

The importance of improving collection utilization through easier access is not a recent notion. It is probably as old as the most ancient library. In 1970, Ben Bowman offered one early and perceptive observation on the changing library environment. Recognizing that research library problems were intensifying, Bowman proposed an alternative set of principles for rationalizing library problems. Briefly summarized, he urged reserach libraries to give increasing attention to (1) availability as opposed to acquisition, (2) cooperation as opposed to self-reliance, and (3) acceptance of centrally produced bibliographical data as opposed to creation of local, customized variations of such data.[4] In order to adjust to a different environment, Bowman foresaw a growing commitment among libraries toward coordinated action, the development of computerized data bases, the standardization of bibliographic records, and the use of specially constructed book storage facilities.

Seven years later, the University of California is seriously considering a plan for its nine separate campus libraries that reflects many of Bowman's principles, that is, a high priority on coordination, standardization of bibliographic data, and systems to improve access to collections throughout the university system.

A campus document delivery system is one technique that can be employed to improve user access to campus library resources. The concept behind such systems is really quite simple. The system permits qualified users to request, in person, by memo, by telephone, or by computer terminal, that a book, journal or photocopy be retrieved from the library and delivered to his/her place of work. The system obviates the requirement that a user fill out the customary borrowing charge record, and it arranges for the return of materials to the library.

A campus based document delivery system can serve the library in several ways other than assisting individuals in their research and teaching. For example, delivery systems can be used to provide materials to research institutes that are dispersed geographically throughout a campus, or to serve the participants of interdisciplinary programs who are geographically dispersed.

The University of California at Berkeley inaugurated a system recently that has been well received by members of the faculty.[5] The service has been labeled a timesaver, a more efficient and effective way to use university funds, and the best means to service a complex university library system. The following three comments are but a sampling of the many unsolicited reactions that have reached the library:

1. "I've been preparing teaching materials for an elementary course, using books and journals from many different disciplines--and therefore library branches. You have saved me endless hours of frustration."

2. "In sheer economic terms, it means that an assistant or I would be free from having to spend hours in the library locating research materials, making out call slips, keeping track of holds, carrying journals to the xeroxing department, et cetera."

3. "For the first time in the four and one half years I've been at Berkeley, I now feel that the Main Library is a usable research resource rather than the hindrance it has so frequently seemed to be. It isn't just that the document delivery service somehow seems to find most of the books. What is most important is that the service has greatly improved my morale. The fact that staff members are now working actively to find books and are taking responsibility for finding them is a great and refreshing step forward."[6]

Document delivery can be used to provide library materials to researchers who are members of institutes and/or laboratories which are widely dispersed throughout a campus. The customary course of campuses has been to allow these research institutes to develop small, specialized, stand-alone libraries. Of course, document delivery will not satisfy all needs, but its availability provides one convincing argument for those who do not wish to underwrite the cost of supporting additional institute libraries.

Document delivery systems can also be designed to serve the needs of scholars working in interdisciplinary programs. For example, at Berkeley, the campus decided to undertake an interdisciplinary health sciences program, but the planners did not (and still do not) contemplate the construction of a new health sciences library. In order to develop an alternative to the traditional library, the General Library, with generous support from the National Library of Medicine, developed a scheme of personalized services, including document delivery, to serve the information needs of faculty and students. This Health Science Information Service serves representatives from the faculties of Zoology, Public Health, City and Regional Planning, Physiology, Anatomy, Optometry, Genetics, Public Policy, Anthropology, Social

Welfare, and Biochemistry. The HSIS has become a quasi-intra-campus network, since it is the service agency which acts as an intermediary between the interdisciplinary programs, faculty and students, and the multi-branch library system.

Campus based document delivery systems, though not a new concept, can have considerable impact on the service posture of a research library, particularly when the service satisfies all of the criteria enumerated earlier. User reactions to a delivery system are likely to be dramatic. Almost as certainly, most of the faculty who use the service will alter their attitudes toward the library. The attitudinal change can almost be guaranteed. In a 1972 study, one hundred members of the faculty of Syracuse University were interviewed. One of the questions asked was, "When you need a specific item from the library, what would you estimate as your expectation that, when you leave the library, you will have the item in hand?" Faculty were asked to rate their response on a scale of 0 to 10, with 5 interpreted to mean the material would be located half of the time and 10 to mean that the material would always be located. The average response of those interviewed was 5.10 or, in other words, individuals felt that they were able to locate and retrieve materials they wanted about half of the time.[7] Later, sixty-nine known users of the Ohio State University library document delivery system were interviewed. The attitudes of these faculty were much more positive toward not just the delivery service but toward the entire library and its performance. They perceived that the library was doing a better job, and they estimated their success at locating materials not at fifty percent, but at seventy-five percent.[8]

It must be emphasized that, in both cases, the observations were based on attitudes rather than on actual library performance. However, these perceived attitudes raise questions about how effective libraries are in their actual performance. Is there a significant variation between the attitudes of users regarding library performance and the actual performance provided to those users? The anecdotal evidence with which I am familiar suggests that faculty frequently rate the library's performance at about 50-50. However, data collected at the University of Colorado and at Berkeley differ from the typical 50-50 level of performance.[9,10] These data suggest that faculty users can expect a much greater than 50-50 probability of locating desired materials in the library. Last year, the document delivery service at Berkeley received over 16,000 requests. Almost seventy percent were filled, and an additional twenty-five percent produced a positive report, e.g., "on reserve," "at the bindery," "in circulation," or "not owned."[11] The performance of a similar service at the University of Colorado was comparable to the Berkeley experience. Books and journals were delivered sixty-nine percent of the time, with an additional twenty-seven percent of the requests generating a status report.[12]

The campuses at the University of Colorado, Ohio State University, and the University of California, Berkeley all maintain decentralized library collections. They are all large universities that employ and support many highly specialized research staff. Based on the data collected at these institutions, it would appear that, if another similarly organized university library were to introduce a document delivery service like those reported in this paper, the outcome would replicate the empirically verified experiences of Ohio State, Colorado and Berkeley.

The experiences documented in the research study cited earlier, plus the attitudes of faculty and administrators at both the University of Colorado and the University of California at Berkeley, suggest that those who propose a campus document delivery system can anticipate a negative attitude from persons who have not been exposed to such a system. For example, in interviews with 100 faculty members who had no prior experience with document delivery systems, the overall attitudes were manifestly negative. The following quotes were typical of initial reactions: "Poor use of library funds", "Students can be used to fetch materials", "Useless waste of resources", "Financially impossible", "Faculty are not that busy", "Library can go too far in providing services", "Wish to retain browsing".[13] However, once the system is in operation, attitudes begin to assume a different tone. One particularly vocal Berkeley professor lambasted and consistently opposed the concept of funding the Berkeley document delivery system. This professor, along wtih several of his departmental colleagues, have since become "converted sinners" in his words.

Some of my colleagues, within both ARL and the University of California, although committed to the objective of improved access, do not believe that campus based delivery systems warrant a high operational priority.[14] Many of their objectives run parallel to those discussed earlier. Some do not believe the service can be operated economically; others fear the service will prove counter-productive by encouraging faculty to stay outside the library. These objections are representative of those with which one must cope if a library decides to add a delivery dimension to its traditional services.

There are operational problems associated with delivery systems that may be difficult to avoid. For example, the service may become too popular. The service demand may increase so rapidly that performance is degraded. Some arbitrary control mechanism would then have to be introduced. In the first year at Berkeley, the number of requests totalled 7,050. A year later, demand had increased to over 16,000. After the second year, we decided to introduce a modest fee to level out the rate of demand. The dollar assessment was not an attempt to recover costs; this strategy just seemed the simplest method

of controlling demand. A library wishing to avoid fees might opt for a quota system, whereby each department or individual would be granted a limited number of transactions per year. As a matter of fact, during fiscal year 1977-78, the Berkeley schedule of fees will be structured so that users who exceed 125 requests must pay a premium for each additional transaction.

There are growing indications that academicians are beginning to reexamine the roles of the university research library. There seems to be greater emphasis on improving availability and access to resources and less emphasis on collection development *per se*. As the national network evolves, it will be easier for library users to locate information about books they desire. This comprehensive bibliographical access will lead to even heavier burdens on the existing, overtaxed interlibrary loan networks. Consequently, the need for better, more capacious document delivery systems will emerge as a major library issue.

Although research libraries will continue to be the principal repositories for the materials which support humanistic and scientific research, changes are likely to occur in the way libraries develop their collections. Greater reliance will be placed on the collections available at neighboring institutions, and libraries will slowly reduce the scope of their collecting. Research libraries may broaden their interpretation of what constitutes their prime constituency. Increasingly, research libraries will serve as regional research centers. The intent of Higher Education Act Title II-C is to assist the nation's research libraries in maintaining the quality of specialized research collections. At the same time, acceptance of Title II-C funds will constitute at least a moral (perhaps even legal) obligation for those institutions which accept funds to become regional resource backup libraries.

Research librarians should begin now to consider how they can best assume the changing role that will be assigned to them. Permitting greater access and taking measures to improve availability will bring a new set of problems. Collections will be subject to more mutilation, theft, and accelerated physical deterioration. These same libraries must therefore take steps to improve access, while minimizing the problems of physical deterioration. It will be no easy task.

References:

1. To better understand the RLG philosophy the reader might wish to consult the 1975-76 Annual Report of the Research Libraries Group prepared by James A. Skipper, President.

2. Richard De Gennaro, "Austerity, Technology, and Resource Sharing: Research Libraries Face the Future", Library Journal, May 15, 1975, p. 918.

3. Daniel Gore, "Farewell to Alexandria: the theory of the no-growth high performance library", in Farewell to Alexandria, solutions to space, growth, and performance problems of libraries, ed. by Daniel Gore. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1975.

4. Ben Bowman, "Problems and assumptions in research libraries". In Rationalizing Research Libraries in the 70's. Proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Five Associated University Libraries. November 12, 1970. Syracuse, N.Y., FAUL, 1970.

5. Anne G. Lipow, "Library services to the graduate community: the University of California, Berkeley", College and Research Libraries, May 1976, p. 254-5.

6. Comments submitted by users are kept on file in the Office of the Head of the Delivery Service Unit.

7. R. M. Dougherty and L. L. Blomquist, Improving Access to Library Resources: the Influence of Organization of Library Collections and of User Attitudes toward Innovative Services. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1974, p. 90.

8. Dougherty and Blomquist, pp. 49-66.

9. R.M. Dougherty, "The Evaluation of a Campus Document Delivery Service". College and Research Libraries, Jan. 1973, pp. 29-39.

10. Anne G. Lipow, "Library Delivery Service: status report as of 31 May 1976.

11. Dougherty, p. 33.

12. Anne G. Lipow, "Library Delivery Service: status report as of 31 May 1976."

13. Dougherty and Blomquist, pp. 111-115.

14. The University of California is preparing a Master Plan for library development. Included in the plan are provisions for improving user access to library resources. For a detailed discussion see The University of California Library; a Plan for Development. Draft plan prepared by the Office of the Executive Director of Universitywide Library Planning. Berkeley, California, Systemwide Administration, 1976. 229 pp. Chapter 6, "Delivery and Use of Materials".

Discussion

MR. STUART-STUBBS: (British Columbia) Let me tell you what happens when you terminate a system of this kind. I don't really know who started the documents delivery program at UBC--I think it was Harlow in the Fifties--but we had rather a smooth operation going that was taken for granted. It involved xeroxing journals for faculty members and so on. In a way it wasn't terribly expensive. It was part of the library operation. It only took the time of two full-time faculty assistants, and I suppose the budget might have been $20,000. But the political mistake--and I warn you people against this--is that the delivery system was under the control of the physical plant. As soon as budget pressure appeared, the pysical plant decided this was a good place they could cut. Interestingly enough, the University Administration, although we were bombarded with complaints, did not react strongly to the situation. The attitude of the President was, "Well, why not make those lazy, overpaid, underworked so-and-so's walk?" So, that was that. Faculty delivery went down after about a quarter of a century. I was sorry to see it go, although I could reallocate staff.

After a period of time, and after the waves began to die down, I was interested in the reaction that we received from some faculty. I am talking about a period of a quarter of a century we were delivering material. One man said to me, "I haven't been in the library for years, and I was amazed to find a lot of material that I found was useful to me and my students." I am suggesting that, in a matter like this, where you cut, there are benefits both ways. I would say documents delivery is politically effective. I am not sure it is cost effective. If it is cost effective, it assumes that the faculty's time is being put to good use some other ways. My own observations of the faculty lead me to believe it is not being used.

MR. DOUGHERTY: First, I would agree that it is risky to leave the delivery up to a campus delivery service. In our case, the system is under the library's control. Second, I have heard arguments pro and con on whether this keeps faculty away from the library. I would say two things: One, documents delivery is not a panacea; it does not eliminate everything else. It is only an adjunct. Secondly, there is some evidence at Berkeley that the service has acted as a stimulus in bringing faculty and staff together. We have organized a series of faculty seminars as the direct outgrowth of this program, at which about 78 members of the humanities and social science faculties have agreed to be taught by librarians in 2-day sessions. This all came from exposure to a new library service. So, I suspect there is a whole variety of things that can happen, depending on the local circumstances.

MR. PINGS: (Wayne State) I have some figures that go back ten years to when we started providing facsimile copies from serials only. That is the only kind of delivery we have ever had. Our service has never been available by telephone, because, as most of you know, we do not give anything away free. The faculty have always had to pay. We stopped the circulation of all serials, and, depending upon the library, this permits us to fill between 95 to 99 percent of all the requests we get for materials that are on our list of serials. The reasons we cannot fill the remainder are: 1) the material is at the bindery, 2) the material has been mutilated, 3) the material is lost, or 4) our records are wrong. This service is continuously growing, not because it is free, but because, depending on the unit, we have 85 to 95 percent of the material that is asked for. You can't publicize these figures because it is difficult when you really keep track of such a service to keep copyright from bothering it. There are departments that make no use of the serials we collect, but there are others where we have on the average of 125 to 130 uses per faculty member.

One major consideration in operating this service is dependability. We have found that faculty will accept a one-week turnaround time. If it is one week, one day, we start getting telephone calls. This must be the academic habit. We spend too much time each week calling. If the request comes in on Tuesday and the person does not have it by the following Tuesday, we are faced with all kinds of extra work answering telephones.

Is the service good or bad? When we consider that we can fill 95 percent of the requests, I think we are doing quite well. When you ask whether it costs money, everything costs money, and it is up to the faculty member to decide how that cost gets paid. Often, the departments will pay for this, but some of the individual faculty members have to pay. We take requests from departments who decide they are going to give this service to their faculty free, and there are instances in which we will say to certain faculty, "Because you have problems of geography, we will give you a little quota for free." There are all kinds of things you can manipulate, but the important thing is that this gives you the power to reveal to your faculty that there is a library and that it can be gotten to.

MR. KREISSMAN: (U. Cal. Davis) Richard will forgive me if I open up a family feud here. It is my turn to wear the black hat, but I must say at the outset that this is in no way a disagreement with his basic thesis. I think what some of us face when we consider this type of program is a question of cost effectiveness. If we could identify the number of hours saved, let's say 275 hours, and the University could add 300

hours of instructional time as a result, I would regard that as a saving. To put it another way, if you could account for the time saved by a documents delivery system as instructional time that was released, and the University could fire three faculty members, that would be a saving. You realize I am talking somewhat facetiously in this matter. Nonetheless, I believe there is an implicit statement here which has gone unchallenged but which is basically incorrect. That is, if you release a faculty member--who is supposedly spending 30 hours a week teaching and five hours in the library doing research--from his five hours in the library, will he add five hours to his productive time? My feeling is, of course, that he will spend that five hours fishing or putting up shelves in his vacation cabin, so that saving is rather vague to me.

My basic stance here is that if, in shuffling through the great variety of your unmet needs--recognizing that there is a finite pot from which all your services must come--a document delivery service comes up number one, I have no objection to it. But I doubt that, in the establishment of a documents delivery service, all of your unmet needs are ever evaluated. I recognize here you are dealing with the most influential and visible community on the campus, namely, the faculty, and who would not like to be told by the faculty "You are a great library"? But contrast the value of a documents delivery system with the value of putting the same amount of money into opening hours for undergraduate and graduate students. True, 25 percent of them disappear every year, and we all operate for the visible, for the pat on the back. But whether this is the best use of that money I do not know. I would say, therefore, that, in the evaluation of anything like a documents delivery service, you must take in all the priorities that exist within your particular situation. Here, once again, the configuration of a campus comes in. A campus with 23 to 40 branch libraries has quite a different problem than a campus with only three or four.

MR. DOUGHERTY: You are not being facetious at all, I want everyone to know, but I would like to add to something you said. In the beginning, we did a study on the amount of direct cost associated with the service compared with the time it took a researcher, faculty member, or graduate assistant to do the same job. There isn't any question, from the point of view of time saving, that the service is cost-effective. It was so dramatic it didn't seem wise three years ago to continue. On the other hand, I doubt whether the faculty member is going fishing, considering the pressures on tenure and the condition of fishing in the Bay. Thinking of those factors, I suspect a number of them are staying home and doing some research.

Also, I would not necessarily advocate the same thing for

each campus, even of the University of California. We are one big happy family, and one of the reasons is that we have nine campuses doing things nine different ways. That is the strength of the system. I was only suggesting that on some campuses, and particularly on decentralized campuses, document delivery has worked very well.

MR. STUART-STUBBS: How much does it cost you, have you any estimate?

MR. DOUGHERTY: About forty to forty-five thousand dollars.

MR. LATHEM: (Dartmouth) If we could have half the money that Richard is spending on a delivery system and could use it for an advertising campaign to change the perception of the faculty about their success rate in the library, that might be money well spent. What I heard Richard saying was that, really, the success rate is something around 75 percent under normal circumstances, but everybody believes it is 50 percent. All we have to do is change their perception. Maybe we could get them to believe that it was 95 percent.

INTERLIBRARY LOAN

James Skipper

Research Libraries Group

Introduction

MR. BOSS: Now we have come to the missing link in the program, the one that our typesetter missed, James Skipper of the Research Libraries Group. He will be talking about Interlibrary Loan, which is a topic of concern to all of us.

* * *

JAMES SKIPPER: In responding to Richard's invitation to talk about interlibrary loan, I thought it might be useful to note some of the verities that I have personally seen concerning this mode of access to public material and then perhaps say just a few words about my experience.

Collections in research libraries can be characterized by the fact that they are large in size, they contain material thought to be essential for scholarly inquiry, and a very large portion of them is seldom used. Thus, theoretically, under appropriate conditions, research libraries should be able to make an appreciable part of their collections available to others through interlibrary loan without seriously interfering with access by local users. This leads to an examination of what these "appropriate conditions" might be, or, to put it another way, "What are the reasonable expectations to be associated with access to library resources by interlibrary loan?"

A major component of an interlibrary loan system can be described as "bibliographic access". The normal sequence of events begins with a "known item" search. The reader must know with some precision the bibliographic description of the text which is wanted, and the library forwarding the request usually has a responsibility to verify its bibliographic accuracy. Continued problems with inaccurate citations for loan requests will very quickly put the borrowing library at the absolute bottom of any priority list maintained by lending institutions.

The second component of a loan system falls under the general rubric of "physical access". The efficiency of the system is strongly related to successfully identifying the location of a wanted item. Unfortunately, national and regional systems for the location of books and related materials are deficient, but it is anticipated that emerging machine-readable data bases will afford a substantial improvement in locating materials for interlibrary loan--at least for currently acquired materials.

Among several observations which can be offered concerning physical access, it can be stated that an effective loan system cannot be based entirely on sharing a poverty of resources among a number of libraries; yet we all have systems which have tried this. Put another way, institutions with deficient collections must have access to libraries with stronger resources, and this dependency introduces a number of problems.

In interlibrary loan systems, as with life in general, there is no free lunch. That is to say, there is no such thing as free library service. Someone must pay for access to information. The only question is how the expense is to be shared between the parties involved. The "balance of trade" in lending between strong collections is likely to be generally equalized. However, when a serious "net lending" situation develops between the weak and the strong, eventually there will be pressures for some type of recovery for at least direct costs. Net lenders within a state system of higher education typically justify increases in staff and operating budgets by quite correctly citing services provided to less advantaged libraries either within the system or without.

Libraries primarily supported by private funds must either charge a loan fee or set aside ever increasing amounts of endowment to cover direct costs. In supporting the New York State interlibrary lending system, the state provides a payment for loans supplied. Within the past few years some of our larger privately supported libraries have found it necessary to charge fees for loans. Perhaps a reference to the members of the Research Libraries Group will illustrate the reason. Last year the libraries of Columbia, Harvard, and Yale University, and the research libraries of the New York Public Library lent 110,000 more items than they borrowed. Assuming the direct cost of a filled loan transaction to be $7.00 (which does not include the cost of acquiring, cataloging and housing the wanted item), these libraries spent $770,000 serving as national resources for other libraries. If one can expect a 5-percent return on investment, the four institutions had to set aside an aggregate of approximately $15 million in endowment to support interlibrary access to their collections. Loan service without fee has been provided by net lenders until the recent massive losses in library purchasing power made it an economic impossibility for some libraries to continue providing interlibrary services without charging fees.

Another condition of a loan system is that materials used locally with reasonable frequency must be excluded from interlibrary loan requests. Most of our collections are developed primarily for the use of local readers, with interlibrary loan to other constituencies being accorded a lower priority.

For this reason, loans related to undergraduate instruction or currently published domestic trade books are usually excluded from interlibrary loan systems.

The mechanics of an interlibrary loan system should provide for the efficient transmission of loan requests as well as quick referral to the most promising secondary source if the item cannot be supplied from the first location queried. As part of the referral chain, it may be desirable to establish a hierarchical system to assure that as many loans as possible will be obtained close to home. This will help avoid an overload on the few major libraries which serve as collections of last resort for the system.

Response time in document delivery is obviously critical, and it is usually true that the greatest delay occurs in communications between the decentralized units of a local library system. Dependability in response to loan requests is of equal importance to speed. Users should have assurance that the system will be reliable in providing a high incidence of filled responses within acceptable time limitations.

Within the limits of copyright, providing surrogates for the original text is useful in increasing access to collections. While the economics and state of the art of facsimile transmission place this technology some distance in the future, the use of microfilming technology contributes to both the preservation and efficient transmission of text. The industry continues its quest for a reader which will become as acceptable to users as a portable typewriter. For the transmission of a limited number of pages, electrostatic prints are usually to be preferred.

There are, of course, types of materials and types of scholarly inquiry for which interlibrary loan is not an acceptable answer. In these instances, on-site use is required. The "busing" provision of the new Berkeley-Stanford cooperative program--with its "Gutenberg Express"--is an interesting example of how we can move people to library resources rather than depending solely on moving resources to the reader.

While the cost of operating an interlibrary loan system can be measured with some precision, the benefits are difficult to quantify in monetary terms, unless it can be assumed that loan access to a given corpus of materials saves the borrowing library definable costs in collection development.

To avoid many of the problems inherent in loan systems which are based on existing library organizations and structures, strong arguments can be made for the establishment of collections exclusively dedicated to interlibrary loan. Such

collections resolve the problem of conflicting priorities between local and remote users. The centralization of resources and availability of single journal issues offers a vast improvement over reliance on a widely decentralized deployment of bound resources. By concentrating the collection within definable limits, the difficulty of locating a wanted text is also largely resolved. I agree with Herman Fussler that continued reliance on decentralized collections, each with a primary constituency, ". . . seems likely to be more costly in aggregate expenditures, less stable, less reliable, less comprehensive, and a slower system of access for contemporary and future acquisitions than a centralized pool approach."[1] The proof of the pudding is that service from a dedicated collection in Yorkshire, England, frequently exceeds both the reliability and response times experienced in obtaining photocopy from libraries in our own country.

Now a word, if I may, about the Research Libraries Group. RLG started with a limited number of programs designed to change the attitude, perceptions, procedures, and policies of the four libraries in offering service to their constituents. One of the most important changes was our effort to improve access to a collective pool of some 25 million volumes, a quarter million serial subscriptions, and related materials. I think the system has been enormously successful. We have almost cut response time in half. The activity has increased at a doubling rate during the first two years of its existence. We started by constructing policy statements to guide RLG in this access-reciprocal access policy, the objective of which was, for example, to make resources at Columbia as accessible to Yale faculty and students as they would be to Columbia faculty and students. There are some exceptions to this, but that, nevertheless, is the principal idea. All the libraries have subscribed to this objective. If a loan is refused by any local public service unit, in most of our institutions this is reviewed by an RLG coordinator to determine whether the refusal is local or not. We have found that about 40 percent of the materials requested are in RLG collections, and about 72 percent are actually sent.

We have a management data program, which defines the characteristics of materials sent and, perhaps even more importantly, the characteristics of items which cannot be supplied. I was interested in the figure that perhaps 6 percent of requests were not supplied because the materials were not on the shelf. This has been our experience. Of requests not supplied we find about 3 to 4 percent are in circulation locally, which relieves us greatly, because this means that we are not causing serious disturbance or interference with local access. We find about 4 percent cannot circulate, 4 percent of items not supplied

cannot be circulated because of poor condition. Again, paralleling the experience mentioned by several speakers earlier, we find that the worst problem we had was with the local campus delivery system. I think I had better stop there if we are going to get out by 12:00 o'clock.

MR. PINGS: (Wayne State) When you quote 110,000, is none of that facsimile?

MR. SKIPPER: It includes facsimile as well as original.

MR. PINGS: And your institutions have not passed on the cost of duplicating?

MR. SKIPPER: No. RLG pays for it within RLG.

MR. PINGS: So your figures are saying you need an endowment even if you are getting some income from other institutions?

MR. SKIPPER: I doubt if the interlibrary fee would go far to pay for facsimiles. None of these fees pay the cost of originally buying that book and cataloging that book or holding it.

MR. ATKINSON: (Ohio State) I am sympathetic to the problems of private institutions, but some of our perceptions of those problems vary in different kinds of institutions. I suspect that our perceptions may in fact be interfering with our actual experience. On the question of hierarchies, for example, and how you find things where you expect to on interlibrary loan, I think that process remains unknown.

An interesting experience in Illinois: There is a suburban library system in the western and southwestern suburbs of Chicago which we back up quite heavily. Contrary to what I suspect is a widespread belief, it does not take a large library, a major net lender, to satisfy most of the interlibrary loan demand from this system. In fact, some 60 percent of the demands of the patrons in those libraries can be met through the system's collections. This is true even though the system is made up of very small libraries. Oak Park is smaller than our departmental libraries. Most libraries in the system are about the size of our smallest departmental library. So, I am very doubtful about subscribing to any theory or system which assumes that it takes large collections of unused materials to satisfy the bulk of the national demand. Experience with multitype systems also reflects that this is not exclusively a public library phenomenon. So, I have great suspicion about that kind of assumption.

Secondly, I would suggest that those enormous costs and the slowness of the systems you describe may not be inherent

in systems for interlibrary loan. The massive kind of bibliographies that we use and the data bases they require, the slow, cumbersome, and very accurate transmission of data itself may be more a product of our library systems than it is a product of the needs of the receiving library or the patron who made the request in the first place.

MR. DE GENNARO: (Pennsylvania) I have heard a lot about interlibrary loan in recent years, and I think it ought to be put in perspective. I looked at statistics in my own library recently, and found that we were lending something like 7,000 items on interlibrary loan and borrowing maybe three or four thousand every year. This turns out to be a very inconsequential percentage of our total use. Our total circulation in these same libraries would be maybe 500,000, and, since we don't lend journals, I would estimate the total in-and-out of building at somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million. When you put the interlibrary loan traffic up against that, it remains an important item, but one has to keep it in perspective. I sometimes think we spend far more time thinking and talking about interlibrary loan than the whole problem is worth.

MR. ATKINSON: Some of us have different figures. At Illinois, we must lend about 110,000 items a year, and we borrow about seven. That is one institution, so it is not so insignificant in our case. But the question of how much it is interfering with our operations is very peculiar. As soon as some obscure state library figured out they paid us $2.75 every time we lent something, suddenly the priorities changed. I became very anxious to see that interlibrary loans did not cost more than $2.75, and it turns out that this is the case. So, I'm very distrustful of these reports this association paid for that interlibrary loans cost $22.00. But, you know, if we could get $23.00 every time we lent something, almost any of us would damn well find a way to do it for $2.50.

MICROFORMS

Francis Spreitzer

Introduction

RICHARD BOSS: It is a really great pleasure to have the guru of microform librarians speak with us today on the subject of microform access. Our speaker had one of the outstanding microfilm facilities for well over a decade, and, not content with providing excellent service on the University of Southern California campus, he has substantially influenced the development of microforms and facilities elsewhere in the country.

What you are about to see is a trimmed-down version of a presentation that was originally made at the First and Second Microform Conferences sponsored by Microform Review. If there are any missing elements, it is because of the limited time we have available. I would hope that any missing elements might be brought out during the discussion this morning, because I think you are aware that, if we have an access problem with hard copy materials, we compound that problem by inserting a piece of electrical equipment between the user and the information. This is true not only for technological reasons but also because there are attitudinal problems with this medium which extend to librarians to some extent. So, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have Francis Spreitzer talk to us this morning.

* * * *

(The following text summarizes Mr. Spreitzer's audio-visual presentation.)

FRANCIS SPREITZER: There are three steps in accessing information in the library: finding the address (bibliographic access), obtaining the material (physical access) and reading the material (intellectual access). Whether the information is in book- or microform, these steps are, in principle, the same; some of the procedures and the possible problems, however, can vary greatly.

If the user is looking for a book, the first step, finding (or not finding) it in the catalog, is usually quite simple. Having found the address, alas, does not necessarily guarantee finding the book. But, if the book happens to be on the shelf, unmutilated, the last step, using it (reading or copying) is normally not difficult. On the other hand, once the call number is known, getting a microform in most academic libraries is no problem. At present, ready availability is the strongest asset of library microforms.

With microforms, utilization is the problem area. Whereas the user of printed material has a great deal of freedom in choosing where and how to read a book or periodical, microforms restrict the user. Microforms must be read with the help of a machine, and the user needs to learn how to use the machines and therefore modify his working methods. For the most part, he is inescapably dependent on the library's provision of reading facilities, furnishings, maintenance and service. At the present there are well planned, attractively furnished, well lit, pleasant microform reading rooms in some libraries, but these are exceptions. Generally, the large research library

continues to allocate unattractive and insufficient space, nondescript furnishings (or worse), dingy lighting and inadequate staffing to this function. The contrast in the environmental qualities of general reading areas and the microform use areas--even in some architecturally ambitious new library buildings--can be striking.

Beyond equipment, environment, and working space, the user faces other basic problems: difficulty in finding information on the microform and the questionable legibility of the image. The typical microform is a reprint of a book or periodical originally published in codex form, but now transferred onto a scroll (microfilm) or onto a multi-image flat sheet (microfiche). The characteristics of these media are very different from the original; so much so, that the adequate transfer of a book or periodical to microform would demand reformatting or conversion, not mere "microreproduction." Both commercial and institutional microfilmers fail to consider this matter. Their attention seems exclusively focused on minimizing production costs, and they pay no attention to efficient user access.

This concentration on cheap production at the expense of utility carries over into the efforts toward microfilm standardization. The recent standard for newspaper microfilming (Microfilming Newspapers, NMA MS111-1975) advocates a preference for image position "B" (printed lines parallel with the edges of the film), arguing that it costs less to film that way. Unmentioned is the fact that it is far easier to locate the desired material on the screen if the image is in position "A". Furthermore, "A" permits larger images, with concurrent improvements in legibility--both for reading and for making hard copies--and a reduction in the wear-and-tear on the film. It would seem appropriate to consider not only the original costs, but user convenience and long-term library economies as well.

The proposed revision of PH5.1 (microfilm reader standard) fails the user for a different reason. It is long on specifications and short on standardization. The opposite would better serve the interests of the library and library user. Even the novice can see whether the image on the screen is sufficiently sharp, or hear whether the fan is quiet or loud. But many librarians may not discover in time, i.e., before purchasing, that the filmpath in a recently introduced microfilm reader is different from the two "de facto standard" filmpaths which were used in all library microfilm equipment for the past 40 years. It would seem that one of the purposes of a microform reader standard should be the prevention of unnecessary proliferation of confusion. We need standards and guidelines that will benefit the user, both for what the library buys and for what the library provides: facilities, maintenance, service, and staffing.

User access depends on systems performance, and bibliographers and acquisition people play an important role in it. They can insure that the library acquires only publications which are actually usable in microform, and only those that have a quality appropriate for the intended use. As long as it yields legible images, any film may be used for material that is kept only a limited time. For permanent retention, however, it seems prudent to insist on film which meets established standards for material, processing and storage, and with which libraries have actual long-term experience.

User resistance is a phenomenon more often encountered in library literature than observed in the microform reading room. When it occurs, more often than not it seems a reasonable reaction to the shoddy treatment microforms and microform users receive in some libraries. On the whole, it is amazing how patient users are and how many hurdles they will willingly overcome in the effort to gain access to information.

The fact that, until now, most material held in microform has been unavailable to the user in other forms might account for some of this patience. "A microform in hand is better than a bibliographic bird in the bush!" It remains to be seen what will happen when libraries begin replacing some of their hard copy materials with microform copies, e.g., if we substitute microforms for binding, not just for frequently mutilated periodicals, but on a fairly large scale. Students and faculty might not object, at least not until they start comparing the convenience, cost and quality of copying journal articles on self-service photocopiers with using microform reader/printers for the same purpose.

The pictures shown have documented that satisfactory library microform service requires generous amounts of space and substantial aggregate expenditures. Up to the present, user demand for microform facilities and services has been minimized by a subtle, effective administrative technique: bibliographic control. Material not known to be in the library is unlikely to be requested. With the increasing emphasis on working collections and other changes in the academic library climate, however, the use of this device and the assumptions and value judgments which underlie it will be challenged. Signs of improvement are becoming more numerous. The day of first-class citizenship for microform users is dawning in some libraries.

I see two requirements for improving user access to microforms. First, collection developers, bibliographers, and the acquisitions and cataloging staff must take an interest in--and develop an appropriate degree of expertise in--library micrographics. Interest simply must extend beyond microform librarians. The attitudes and performance of the larger staff determine to a large degree the success of microform utilization in the library. Second, in matters micrographic, we must resist thinking small. The most vicious characteristic of microforms is their uncanny ability to induce librarians to think small. For better use of microforms, we need to think bold and big.

* * *

Discussion

MS. PERRY (Rochester): I find it very interesting that you started with the card catalog, where I think one of our big problems is the unavailability of analytics and the lack of money to purchase them. Would you like to address yourself to that?

MR. SPREITZER: That is a familiar problem. Wherever I go, microform library staff complain about the lack of analytics. They appreciate the difficulties of the catalog department, but say that, without sufficient analytics, users do not know what the library has in microform. We may generalize and say

that the catalog contains many more books and journals than are actually available to the library user; but the opposite is true for microforms.

Those micropublishers who sell analytic cards for their publicatons report that librarians are not very anxious to pay for them, and that, often, the purchased cards are not filed. As we well know, sometimes the reason for not filing is the poor quality of some of the cataloging. We hope for future relief. The Resources Section Micropublishing Committee (ALA-RTSD) is trying to find another approach to help solve this perennial problem. A clearinghouse for cataloged large sets, which a library is willing to share with others, might be part of the answer. Ultimately, I think we shall reach the point where we no longer make distinctions in cataloging a title because of its format, that is, we will treat microforms the same as other materials. That day has not come yet, and we are all aware of the reasons, the primary one being money.

MR. BOSS: A number of you may recall that, a few years ago at an ARL meeting, a speaker discussing bibliographical access to microforms said that it was unfortunate there was no way libraries could afford full cataloging of microform materials with analytics. That comment seemed to go unchallenged until cocktails that evening, when someone said, "So-and-So, what would you do it, all of a sudden, the hard copy publication industry made a major breakthrough and was able to deliver hard copy books at a dollar a title, which is currently being charged for microform titles? Would you give up cataloging classification with analytics? Or would you find some way of accommodating? The person said that wasn't going to happen, period. That was the end of the conversation.

It strikes me that there was, in that question, the crux of all of this. Perhaps, historically, we have assumed that microforms are the least used. Therefore, they are the ones that ought to have the lowest priority for processing. But in fact, many of the things on microform in our libraries have greater potential use for research purposes than does material in hard copy. I think that if we are tied to a permanent term in ability to process everything fully, the utility of the information rather than the physical format of the storage container becomes critical.

MR. LUCKER (MIT): Perhaps, since you truncated your presentation, you did not cover this, but there is another extension of microform service, that is, external use of microforms through circulating microform readers. We have entered into this practice to a fairly great extent and will soon have 50 circulating readers. I was wondering how well the machines can adapt to lighting conditions in the external environments over which we have no control. We lend the reader to the person using the microforms, and they take it with them. I have no idea whether there are problems in a dormitory or office that we cannot control the same way we can control the lighting in the librayr.

MR. SPREITZER: I do not think we have a problem in a dorm situation. The person can turn from the window or other disturbing light source, or turn off the light. Portable microfiche readers--I think you have those in mind--work quite well in such a situation. Portable microfilm readers are in some ways much less satisactory, yet I know of one university library with an active microfilm reader lending program: Indiana. I might want to lend

portable microfilm readers for use of the borrowers' own film, but I would not propose to lend library-owned film. The scratch hazard is too grave. Microfiche seems much more suitable for circulation. With microfiche we might be able to move from being a circulating library to becoming a distributing library. We can duplicate most fiche on demand, give the patron the duplicate, and keep the original on file. We would then have continuous file integrity and convenient access for the user at a cost no higher than circulation. This could be done today. The technology is there, and the economics are right. Copyright is a consideration, but not necessarily a big problem. The most successful circulating--and duplicating--programs involve massive files in the public domain. The real problem is the deterioration in the quality of the fiche the library receives: it makes duplication difficult or impossible. Once again we have the situation of poor quality jammed down the user's throat for the sake of somewhat lower original cost. Concerted effort and timely pressure might help in such cases in the future, but a larger number of influential librarians must become sufficiently well informed and care enough to act when needed.

NON-PRINT

Anne W. LeClercq

Introduction

MR. BOSS: I first met the next speaker on the Atlanta Campus of Emory University at the time she was the film librarian for the Atlanta Public Library. Something struck me at that point, which yet today substantially governs my view toward microforms and non-print materials. That is, that the acceptance with which non-book materials are greeted depends to a very great extent on the enthusiasm of the individual who is actually making the contacts with prospective users. I know of no one in the field who has done a better marketing job for non-print materials than the next speaker, Anne LeClercq.

* * *

ANNE LE CLERCQ: I am not going to talk to you today about video disk. I was at a video show two days ago, and it appears to me that this product is still, perhaps two years in the future. What I am going to talk about is a more general overview of non-print. I use this term "non-print", although you may hear it referred to by names such as media, audiovisual, and many others. It means one thing: information. It is just information by another name.

We all know that instant aphorism, analogous to instant tea or instant breakfast, "The medium is the message." It has been bandied about by instructional technologists for the past decade and used in an unsuccessful attempt to promote something called "mediated learning". However, the time-honored lecture, the Socratic dialogue between faculty and student, and the pursuit of abstract, theoretical learning has not given ground to fancy multiple-screen, multi-sensory presentations. University faculty have avoided slick, prepackaged media presentations and have stuck with their favored media, the lecture or the dialogue, for imparting information and knowledge. If Edgar Dale's "cone of experience" learning theories[1] are accurate, why has the dream of valid media usage had so little impact on higher education today?

It is true there is very little use of non-print material in higher education. I was speaking with one of you last night and he said, "My faculty just are not interested in audiovisual material." Audiovisual media have remained on the periphery of higher education because the caretakers of media on college campuses, a group known as instructional technologists, have been consumed with the trappings of the medium, the endless formats, and the myriad shapes and sizes of equipment. They have forgotten that the central purpose of education is the imparting of information and the creation of new knowledge. They have forgotten that, in the learning process, the message--not its packaging or format--is what is essential. University faculty daily refute McLuhan,[2] sagely knowing that medium is tedium, while the message is at the heart of the instructional process. Poor Marshall McLuhan.

Librarians have watched from our well heeled book havens as audiovisual specialists have recreated the wheel in their overzealous production departments and become mired down in format and equipment proliferation. No one, or almost no one, has sought to collect non-print resources on the same basis as print.

In the past few years some of the larger academic libraries--Maryland, Tennessee, Illinois, Washington, Purdue, to name a few--have begun to collect and service non-print as an information source to be used on an individual basis, and as the need arises, in exactly the manner that printed resources are collected. You may wonder how these non-print departments differ from the traditional audiovisual center. We all know the traditional audiovisual center with its banks of 16 millimeter projectors, screens, and racks of films. Its instructional development teams are notorious for their attempts to "mediate"[3] university and college faculty lectures. By the way, there is no such word as "mediate" in the dictionary meaning what they mean. They mean to "add" slides and other things onto the lecture.

The non-print departments appearing in libraries are collection and student oriented. The principal characteristic of the new non-print departments is that they make non-print information available to students on a one-to-one basis, rather than provide instructional support to faculty in the classroom. These relatively equipment-free, collection-centered non-print departments have been made possible by the revolution in communications technology associated with the computer. Miniaturization has produced the audio and video tape recorder and player, which, for the first time, has meant that non-print resources can be accessible to students. The general characteristics of the audio and video cassette--ease of operation, reliability of tape and machines, excellent picture quality, and the relative cheapness of raw tape--have made audio-visual information widely accessible to students. It is academic libraries which are making these new resources available to students on college campuses across the country.

You, who must respond to so many demands on your collection budgets may legitimately ask what qualities of non-print materials enhance learning in ways that are different from print materials. Why is it so important that you consider including these in your libraries? There are many types of information--abstractions, theories, concepts--for which the use of non-print is most inappropriate. However, non-print materials have several, unique qualities, their immediacy, their ability to capture mood and style, their precise rendering of reality, which they alone can adequately provide. The realistic recording of complex visual data is possible only when all the senses are involved. It is possible through non-print materials to experience an eclipse of the sun, to examine the interior of a beehive, to watch a glacier moving and a flower growing, or to participate in the eruption of a volcano. Only when our auditory and visual senses are involved can we capture the mood and style of a great speaker. What is lost if we merely read the Nixon-Kennedy debates,[4] the Ford-Carter debates, the Roosevelt fireside chats,[5] or perhaps Frost interviewing Nixon, if you saw it two nights ago?

The nuances of a dramatic situation are more evident when heard and viewed. The drama of the McCarthy investigations,[6] the pathos of Ibsen's "The Wild Duck",[7] the humor of Goldsmith's "She Stoops To Conquer",[8] or the wild absurdity of Ionesco's "The New Tenant"[9] can all best be appreciated when made available to students on a video or audio tape. Non-print materials give a quality of immediacy, because sounds and images vicariously recall the entire range of human activity. The performing artist can study his art in the light of many varied interpretations. The student of politics and

history can comprehend more fully all the fluctuating dilemmas of people in war and peace when the sounds and images that characterize them are made available through non-print materials.

There is a wide variety of non-print materials available to meet a library's diverse information demands. There are fragmentary media--a videotape of a television commercial, an audiotape of a Martin Luther King speech, a slide of a Rembrandt crucifixion--each a fragment of reality. Within the context of education, such fragments from nature or history can enlarge a student's sense of the world and the time we live in. There are also uniquely illuminating non-print materials. Such series as Bronowski's "The Ascent of Man",[10] or Kenneth Clark's "Civilization"[11] have an integrity and an artistic and creative life of their own. While they are significant events in themselves, they will also be used and appreciated by students in disciplines as diverse as geography, philosophy, zoology, and art. "The Ascent of Man" series, particularly, has met with a most incredible response on our campus, where departments as diverse as zoology and religion have used the same series.

Real quality productions, masterpieces, are as rare in non-print as they are in the printed medium. Occasionally, though, non-print productions satisfy the demanding criteria of first magnitude creativity. Perhaps you saw Henry James's "The Jolly Corner" this past Tuesday evening on PBS. Other superbly dramatized short stories in this series include Fitzgerald's "Bernice Bobs Her Hair", Flannery O'Connor's "The Displaced Person", and Hemingway's "Soldier's Home".[12] I recently had occasion to talk with Robert Geller, who said, "We wanted to take from the pages of some of our best authors a sampling of characters who are not plastic, not two-dimensional, not so obviously transparent as the offerings of situational television. Sure, we had a responsibility to our viewers, but we also had one to Richard Wright, to Hemingway, Fitzgerald, and Flannery O'Connor."[13] If I have overburdened you with this plethora of examples, it is in the hope of persuading you that non-print resources should have a place in your library just as their printed counterparts do.

Let us assume for a moment that you are induced to bed down with this glamorous morsel named non-print. Will your progeny resemble the wicked daughters of Lot, or the stalwart scion of Romulus? In plainer words, what problems will you encounter in making non-print collections accessible to students? As in all library operations, there are a variety of options for critical non-print decision making with regard to collections, facilities, and staff. Most of you are probably thinking, "What will it cost, how expensive is it?" Each library must analyze its non-print program to determine what budget allocations need to be made for collections, equipment, and staff.

What type of staff support should be provided? Should the collection be housed in a separately staffed department headed by a professional librarian, or should the collection be shelved with the print collections? I think, in the collections which you have, which are so very, very large, an integrated collection is not really an option, because the non-print material will really be lost. Either option has implications for staffing and for the accessibility of the non-print materials to users.

What impact will various forms of delivery, i.e., electronic versus

physical, have on the accessibility of the resources? Perhaps you will decide to do as the University of Florida at Boca Raton has done. Their basic format is 16 millimeter film, and they just make the 16 millimeter projectors available to students in the library. Or, you may do as some of the others have done, installing video equipment so that the student need only come to the service desk and ask for a video socket. The socket can then be put into a video play deck for them so they don't have all the interference of the equipment. There are many options available in the type of equipment you can select. The question is, what types of equipment will you use to make your non-print collection available?

How will you determine which departments and programs within your institution require greater or lesser support from your non-print department? I spoke with one of you last night, and he said, "Gosh, I want no part of the language department or the music department." I feel the same way about nursing. I want no part of the nursing department, because their demands for media are inexhaustible, and they will really have to supply them on their own. You will have to decide which areas on your campus you can afford to serve best. Some disciplines, such as english, anthropology, art, and geology are obvious potential users of non-print resources. The demands of some professional schools, such as nursing, or departments, such as music and language, are perhaps too great to be met by a university-wide service agency such as the library.

What portion of your collection can be cataloged from existing Library of Congress cataloging, and what portion will have to be originally cataloged? Will networks such as the Ohio College Library Center add non-print materials to their data bases in the near future? There are no set answers to these questions, nor is there a great body of library experience from which answers can be drawn. However, unlike an act of faith, the outcome of which is unpredictable, decisions on these various program options can be based on some tried and true library principles" (1) have an understanding of the patrons to be served, (2) have an understanding of the institution in which you are operating, (3) know which components within your non-print program will lead to achievement of your selected objectives.

In considering the barriers which inhibit the availability and use of non-print materials on university campuses, it is important to remember that the faculty member is the prime agent for change. If you invest in the most complete non-print collection and facilities without consulting faculty during every step in the process, there is some possibility that your expensive resources will go unused. Faculty will have to be persuaded that listenting to a poem or a speech, or watching a dramatic production on videotape, is as valuable an experience for the student as reading the poem, speech, or play.

Perhaps the most significant investment you can make is hiring an enthusiastic librarian who perceives his role, in part, as that of a catalyst in changing faculty attitudes. If you can persuade faculty to become involved in selecting and using your non-print collection, you will have a far easier time persuading your administration to provide financial backing. While the barriers inhibiting access to non-print materials are both substantial and numerous, your library can play a crucial part in making such resources available on college and university campuses.

1. Edgar Dale, "Audiovisual Methods in Teaching", 3rd ed. (New York: Dryden Press, 1969) p. 109. Dale's cone of experience is a visual analogy showing the progression of learning experiences from direct, first-hand participation to pictorial representation and on to purely abstract, symbolic expression. Non-print materials at all levels of the cone can help to extend and enhance the web of relations that our concepts involve.

2. Herbert Marshall McLuhan, "The Medium Is the Message" (Sound Recording). Written by Marshall McLuhan, Quentin Fiore and Jerome Agel (Columbia, CS9501). McLuhan has analyzed communication theory and concluded that not only does the medium of communication influence the message but that there is also a congruency between the two.

3. "Mediate". A coined word apparently meaning to add various media to a spoken presentation.

4. John F. Kennedy, "The Four Kennedy-Nixon Debates" (Sound Recording) (Spoken Word, Box K, 1968).

5. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, "The Fireside Chats of FDR" (Sound Recording) (Mass Communications, 1973).

6. Emile DeAntonio, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, a "Documentary of the McCarthy Hearings" (Sound Recording) (Folkways Records, FH 5450).

7. Henrick Ibsen, "The Wild Duck" (Video recording) (BBC-TV, Time-Life Multimedia, 1976).

8. Oliver Goldsmith, "She Stoops To Conquer" (Video recording) (BBC-TV, Time-Life Multimedia, 1976).

9. Eugene Ionesco, "The New Tenant" (Video recording) (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1977).

10. Jacob Bronowski, "The Ascent of Man" (video recording) (BBE-TV, Time-Life Multimedia, 1975). Bronowski covers the cultural evolution of human civilization. He emphasizes our scientific achievements.

11. Kenneth Clark, "Civilisation (Video recording) BBC-TV, Time-Life Multimedia, 1972). Clark encompasses the art and architecture of Western Civilization since the 5th Century.

12. Robert Geller, "The American Short Story" (Video recording) (Learning in Focus, 1977, ongoing series).

13. Frank McLaughlin, "From English Teacher to Filmmaker: A Conversation with Robert Geller", (Media and Methods, March 1977) p. 26.

Discussion

MR. BOSS (Princeton): Did someone say that the Baptist Board of Missionaries is changing its name to Baptist Board of Catalysts? By any name, I hope you can see that a great deal of our efforts surrounding non-print materials involve dealing with people on a direct basis. As often as not, we are addressing attitudes rather than technology. It is in that context that we hope to elicit some questions or suggestions on this topic.

MR. NELSON (Brigham Young): We are considering the delivery of 16 millimeter by a film chain. Our problem is that producers of those films are telling us, "You know, this is against the copyright law." I think this might logically fall within fair use. What is your feeling on that?

MS. LE CLERCQ: I believe that, if you are not broadcasting films to the community, but simply showing them to a classroom, there will be no objection. That would be a violation of copyright. But I am not a lawyer.

MR. FRANTZ (Virginia): Could you tell us of approaches we might make to faculty to win them over? Non-print materials are sometimes too slick for them to understand. Most of the faculty came up through the seminar, where four or five people commented on whatever they were studying. It is now very difficult for them to break away from this pattern, since they would prefer to repeat their own experience to their own classes.

MS. LE CLERCQ: The only way to change attitudes is on an individual basis. I often make presentations to, say, the entire English department. From this, I get only one or two responses, but it is with those people that I attempt to make a breakthrough. Once you have convinced only two or three people in a department that "She Stoops to Conquer" is funny only if you see it, the word gets around to the rest of them. You can't do it en masse. It has to be one-to-one with faculty. Most probably, you can change their attitude by going to the younger faculty.

MR. KUHN (Iowa State): At Iowa State, we have been fairly lucky in involving faculty. We have some 25 different departments, including history, that make use of videotape. We just received a $350,000 grant from the Federal Government, which is interested in video just as it is in microforms. Our goal will be to send 6,000 students to the library over the next two years to utilize 50 video playback units produced on campus. The cassettes are part of an instructional model teaching large groups about library materials. The library will be contributing researchers to the project. We find that, once certain faculty get involved with non-print in any department, everyone gets excited, and the enthusiasm on the campus builds simultaneously.

MS. LE CLERCQ: How did you get the money?

MR. KUHN: I'm not sure.

MR. WEST (Hawaii): Did I understand you to make a distinction between the films, tapes, and the equipment itself? What relationship should there be between the administration of the material and the administration of the equipment?

MS. LE CLERCQ: If possible, the library should not get into the organization of audiovisual equipment on a campus. In my opinion, that does not fall within the range of typical library services. Some of you may be doing this, but it is a headache. A library is for collecting information, and collecting non-print materials clearly falls within that purview. It is now also possible for libraries to make this non-print information available, because of the miniaturization that has taken place in audio and video cassette equipment. We no longer have the problems of setting up carousel projectors or setting up equipment in darkened rooms. But I do think there is a distinction between classroom support--which is what I think you were saying--and the development of non-print sources in the library.

MR. BOSSEAU (Emory): You were addressing the question of software versus hardware, but you don't mean to exclude permanent equipment from the library, do you? I think Mr. West was talking about the administration of equipment that is sent out to classrooms.

MS. LE CLERCQ: You are correct. Thank you for clarifying that for me.

MR. BOSSEAU: We had a new Dean in the business school last year who had been a vice president with Arthur H. Andersen Corporation. That company had purchased a college in Illinois some years back, where they had used the traditional approach to educating all of their CPA's and business managers. When they moved to audiovisual instruction--and especially videotapes--they found they were able to cut their instructional program from six months to three months. When the students came out, they had also absorbed more material in three months than they had been able to in six months using the traditional mold. He was appalled to find that we had no video equipment at Emory University.

MS. LE CLERCQ: Did you help him out?

MR. BOSSEAU: We have been purchasing it, yes.

MR. FORTH (Pennsylvania): I have a certain concern and sympathy with your position, and I agree, having been married for many years to a scientist who found films extraordinarily useful in doing her research, that this approach works very well in teaching science, art, music, and literature. I am perfectly willing to push them as hard as I can on my own campus.

As a former teacher of both graduate and undergraduate students, I think many faculty are turned off by the use of films in such areas as politics, political science, history, sociology and so on, because of the very thing that you mentioned in your talk: the tremendous impact a film makes on the viewer--especially the young viewer. If you are showing a film of babies starving in the streets of Calcutta, it can be pretty raw emotional stuff which gets in the way of what we are trying to do in a classroom, that is, to take a cool, dispassionate, objective look at whatever the problem may be. I think a good many people are really offended by this. A good teacher should be able to use both print and non-print, of course. But what happens with films is that you propagandize students unconsciously, and you get a kind of shallow learning on their part, the kind of thing they learn from television. We know what that has done to the standard of education in our country.

MS. LE CLERCQ: May I have a word?

MR. FORTH: Perhaps you could comment on this for the rest of the day.

MS. LE CLERCQ: The kind of shallow things that appear on TV we only collect for our journalism department. The student can study them as awful examples of what not to do. But, seriously, I don't see how a student can study Martin Luther King without listening to one of his speeches. I don't see how a student of sociology can read about mass culture and study snake handling without perhaps seeing a small film on snake handling. It greatly enhances the experience if you can see it.

MR. FORTH: We have been studying Martin Luther without the aid of films. We never saw him filmed. There was no camera recording him when he was nailing up the tenets on the cathedral doors.

MS. LE CLERCQ: We are much the sadder and lesser that we don't know what he was really like.

MR. FORTH: I think we are better off.

MR. BOSS: I think there are two important distinctions that need to be made. One is that Roosevelt's fireside chat was meant to be heard, and the medium chosen was radio. In order to understand it, one gets a better sense through hearing it than through reading it. To reconstitute, to artificially reconstruct Martin Luther is different than to play back Franklin Delano Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, or Richard M. Nixon, all of whom were heard and seen and whose primary impact was through that particular medium.

We might also think about the fact that, if librarians' traditional expertise with printed material is in selecting, acquiring, organizing it for use, and delivering it to users, why, when we come to non-print, do we seek to go beyond selection, acquisition, organization, and servicing, and get all caught up in how the instructor will incorporate this material into classroom instruction? Why do we seek to advise, or in some way get caught up, in that classroom process? It may be that we have so often run into conflict with the instructional staff of an institution.

MS. LE CLERCQ: You said it better than I can.

(A recess was taken.)

LIBRARY INSTRUCTION

Virginia Sherwood

Introduction

MR. BOSS: Over the past two days we have been talking about library user success and about various obstacles we might seek to identify and overcome. However, I think there is more to it than just removing or reducing the obstacles. There is also seeking to aid our library users in some positive way so that they are more capable of helping themselves to the resources and services our libraries offer.

I first met our next speaker at a Committee on Organization meeting of our American Library Association, when she and several others had to run the gauntlet of ALA bureaucracy and persuade them that there should be a new Library Instruction Round Table in ALA. I was very much impressed by the fact that a group of librarians from all over the country were so committed to the idea of library instruction. They actively shared their expertise with one another, and they were willing to come back again and again in order to establish the support needed for a Library Instruction Round Table.

I felt that anyone who can persuade the ALA Committee on Organization that library instruction is a good thing ought to be able to tackle a hundred library directors without any trouble at all. It gives me pleasure to introduce Virginia Sherwood of the University of California at San Diego.

VIRGINIA SHERWOOD: I am delighted to be here today to talk to you about library instruction. I come to offer you a few ideas about what one library is doing in this area, and to challenge you to do something in your own libraries.

I think we are all aware that the people who come into our libraries do not know how to use them. We find that some people simply do not know how to check out a book. Other people do not know there is a periodical index. There are those who do not know we have special collections that might aid their graduate research. So, there are a variety of levels at which we must be concerned about the knowledge student and faculty users have about our libraries, and that is where instruction comes into play.

Over and over again, I find comments in the literature like: "Undergraduates are confused by the library and require help in finding their way around. They are unfamiliar with card catalogs and require assistance in looking up the simplest things. They have difficulty finding material in the stacks. They know little about bibliographic resources. In other words, they are unfamiliar with the rudimentary mechanics of library use." Those words were spoken about the undergraduates at Yale and their use of record services. But they are very typical of comments about undergraduates everywhere. The same article went on to say, that graduate students were not much more experienced with libraries. They are not much better equipped to use them than undergraduates. We need to set about instructing our users on how to use the libraries.

Four years ago, we took our first step in that direction at the University of California, San Diego, by starting a course for undergraduates on how to use the library. That two-unit, interdisciplinary course attempts to develop students' skills in bibliographic research to the extent that they can write a bibliographic essay on a topic of their choice using the wide variety of resources that are available in the library. The course has been very well received and has gained the attention of the administration. It is taught by a variety of librarians throughout the system and has produced sufficient enthusiasm among students using the library to generate the following comments: "An excellent course for anyone interested in obtaining the maximum use of the library and its resources. . . . It should be a requirement for freshmen students. . . . I think the course would be valuable to anyone this side of a librarian. . . . A very useful course that can make a big difference in how effectively you are able to find information, both throughout college and in life."

This course is only part of a program of instruction, however. There are a variety of other ways that libraries can teach their users how to use the library more effectively. We are concerned with reaching a large number of users, and one of the ways we have done this at UCSD is to conduct one- to two-hour sessions for most of the first year undergraduate writing students. We take them through a simple search strategy which is outlined on the blue sheets you have. We are concerned that students learn to approach the library in a logical, systematic way, and that systematic way we identify as the search strategy. The first thing we do in these sessions is talk to the students, guiding them through examples of a search strategy in a group situation. We then take them through the steps necessary to find information in a subject encyclopedia or some other kind of general handbook, getting an overview of the topic. Next we check the topic against an LC list of subheadings, finding additional headings that might be appropriate. Then, using the subject card catalog, we locate items and try to be sure that the students understand the information on the catalog cards. We move on to selecting periodical indexes and articles appropriate to the topic, and, once we have found articles, we check the serial record to find whether the library actually has them. Finally, we locate the journals in one of our libraries. This exercise in search strategy can be adapted to almost any topic in any course. We give students some flexibility in their choice of topic by handing them an outline of topics from which they may select. In this way, we take a rather large class and break it down into groups of 10 to 20 students. Each group then learns something about the basic tools it should be aware of to start using a library.

We find that most students who go through this exercise have not been aware of subject encyclopedias, periodical indexes, and certainly not LC subject headings; yet these are basic tools for approaching the library. We believe that, once a student has gone into the reference area and has introduced himself to these tools for about an hour, he will be more comfortable coming back to the library. It surprised us initially that students were more than happy to go through the exercise and that they were very appreciative of the information they received. Yet, the exercise is simple enough so that several hundred students can be reached in this manner every year. An exercise like this is only the most basic introduction to library resources, but it is really an icebreaker for most students. We think this is very important.

The UCSD Library has offered instruction in other ways and has not restricted this instruction to students. For example, we have instructed the secretaries who work for physicians and professors on basic reference tools that they need to use in the biomedical library.

What started with a rather formal course for instructing users has expanded into a series of experiments with a variety of instructional approaches directed at a variety of our users. Interest among librarians in library instruction is growing, with the result that a number of self-help types of organizations have been developed. Such things as the state clearinghouses, the Library Instruction Round Table, and various other national organizations are good examples. The great majority of activity in this area has been undertaken by librarians themselves, pulling together to train each other in methods of instruction. I think that the time has come for you to step forward and take a leadership role in developing instructional programs in your libraries. I think that libraries need to incorporate instruction on a level that permits users not just to use basic materials, but to really exploit the material in the library.

I suspect that virtually every user who enters a library is in need of instruction at one level or another. Certainly, our tests indicate this, but I also noticed that the Task Force Report of the Library of Congress contained recommendations for educating scholars about collections and services. We are not just talking about the undergraduate student. We are talking about every user getting additional education to help use our libraries more effectively. Academic libraries should be particularly concerned, because they are part of the educational process, and they should involve themselves fully in that process. They should play their part in teaching students the methods of finding information, and that includes everything from locating a book in the library to understanding computerized literature searching to understanding the vast array of resources both on campus and throughout the academic world.

There is really no end to the need for instruction. There are levels of instruction needed for every user, and I would particularly like to charge ARL with including library instruction among its concerns in the area of management. I think it would be very appropriate for the ARL Office of Management Studies to take a careful look at library instruction in the broadest sense--including the kind of instruction that takes place every day at the reference desk--and see if it could not relate user needs to management patterns in the same way it has for more traditional library operations. I think that the time is here to expand our concept of the library beyond just the maintenance of materials. We must now begin to educate the user by explaining those materials to the fullest extent.

Discussion

MR. DUNLAP (Duke): I think many librarians who have tried to initiate programs of bibliographic instruction have met resistance, if not downright hostility, from certain faculty members. Do you have any experience that might help us reach, or get around, those faculty members who look upon library instruction as a threat to their be-all-know-all stance as far as students are concerned?

MS. SHERWOOD: I think, basically, you have to use the faculty that are receptive to you and avoid approaching those who are not with you at this point.

The other way of handling it might be to do what UCSD did to start with. It was not what we had in mind, but offering a separate course that students can select without threatening an existing faculty domain is a way of handling that situation.

MR. YOUNG (Alabama): A two-part question: I would be interested to know how library instruction activities fit in administratively. In other words, are they under the auspices of the reference department? Or is it a separate unit? About six months ago, our library became very dissatisfied with our lack of progress and established a separate department of library instruction. We staffed it with two full-time professionals, and we have been very pleased with the results.

The second part relates to the evaluation of library instruction, which I think, in many respects, has been a weak link. I think it is important to look at the worksheets the students do to examine their attitude toward the library after the instruction. It seems to me the proof of the pudding is what effect we are having on the term papers and dissertations that people who have been exposed to these instructions write. Are you looking at the citations they are using and so forth?

MS. SHERWOOD: Well, not beyond the specific products of the course at this point. As part of the course, the student must complete a bibliographic analysis, that is, an essay which explains how they use a variety of sources in the library. We do a little pretesting at the beginning of the course to find out if students know anything about the content of catalog cards or citations from periodical indexes like Reader's Guide, and we find that most of the students are missing about half of the information that they can gain from those two simple sources. The term project paper they write at the end of the course is thus a good indicator of what they have learned during the quarter. I would say that the papers are impressive. I think that the students have worked very, very hard with a great deal of coaching. Incidentally, one of the things that distinguishes librarians as teachers is the fact that they have had a great deal of one-to-one contact in over the reference desk, and they are very effective in coaching the students. I think that is an advantage.

As to your first comment about organization, I don't think there is one answer. At UCSD, I am instructional coordinator, but activity takes place in all the libraries. A good part of what we have developed has been the direct result of interest by various librarians. It is not something that I have activated through my program. One caution I would issue about having two librarians in an instructional services department is that I think they run the risk of getting stale. If you must do a great deal of instruction, there is a real danger of this. It is also true that, by engaging all of your librarians in the program, you are better able to adapt to the needs of various users. You can also make use of the diverse talents of your librarians. Some are going to be good in course instruction, others in developing printed or audiovisual materials. In that way, you can probably supply all types of instruction.

MR. YOUNG: Just a point of clarification: These people aren't just doing 40

hours of instruction a week. They are probably instructing 15 hours per week, while the rest of their time is spent coordinating a great variety of other librarians and talking with faculty.

MS. SHERWOOD: That is very good.

MR. KREISSMAN (U. California at Davis): A cautionary note on evaluation. We have a large and extensive educational services program in the library. For one of the courses given by the library to improve access to information there is no standard evaluation and no dissatisfaction. However, there is a second course offered through a hospital department which must be taught by university staff eligible to give grades. Now, library staff are not eligible to give grades, which is why this course must be offered through this particular hospital department. The cautionary note is that, in such a situation, the library administration was challenged to evaluate the teachers giving this course through an outside department. I only mention that as a possibility for those who are contemplating such a program to take into account at the outset.

MR. AXFORD (Oregon): In response to your question about how to get faculties to change their attitude about library instruction, you have got to focus their attention on their critical problem, which is their jobs. In those institutions that are suffering a decline in enrollment, or, even more importantly, where the number of bodies is not declining but students are not taking the full 15-hour loads, you can get the attention of the administration by offering to have students enroll in a 3-hour course, under the auspices of the university library, for credit. Through this mechanism, we have committed ourselves to generating something over $100,000 in tuition income next year. This goes a long way toward alleviating some of the $1,300,000 budget crisis coming up in July. If you can somehow get into this situation, you can use the argument very effectively.

MR. KUHN (Iowa State): My only comment is that I think we can look to faculty really appreciating this course. We teach 6,000 undergraduates through a separate unit. Three years ago, the faculty reorganized our entire undergraduate requirements. Before then, undergraduates had had to take not only library instruction but foreign languages, physical education, and the reading and writing of English. During the reorganization, the faculty knocked off the requirements for physical education and foreign languages, but they insisted that students graduating from Iowa State retain the course in English, so they knew how to read and write, and they insisted that the library retain its course so that students would know how to use the library as well. Once faculty are persuaded that library instructors do a good job, they are willing to drop something else in favor of the library program.

MR. MC DONALD (Connecticut): I thought Ms. Sherwood's answer to Connie Dunlap's question was very apropos. I think an awful lot can be achieved by a little success. At our place, where we have been offering subjects on a demand basis for faculty members, these have stimulated a larger demand than we can now meet. They apparently have been successful. Faculty spread the word and students to a certain extent do too. We are now a victim of our own success.

I wanted to ask one other question of our speaker, and that is: In keeping with the theme of the program today, whether UCSD is using media in any way in instruction. We have had a multimedia show for basic orientation for incoming freshmen, which is also proving to be reasonably successful. It is the kind of thing that you can modify on the basis of experience and improve as you go along. The students are young and impressionable, and, if it is not too good when you start out, the students don't seem to mind.

MS. SHERWOOD: We do not, at the present time, have that type of program. We have equipment and, unfortunately, do not have the staff expertise to develop video or slide-tape. So far, it has been too expensive to get other staff on campus to assist us with this. We do use the traditional overhead transparencies in our instructional program.

MR. LORENZ (ARL): At one time I seem to recall a good deal of money and effort was going into developing self-instruction tools in this area. Can you comment on what has happened to this effort?

MS. SHERWOOD: Like computer assisted instruction?

MR. LORENZ: Yes.

MS. SHERWOOD: Very little, as far as I know, unless someone here is familiar with materials that are available.

MR. MC DONALD: There is a lesson in the Plato system on filing rules or something like that. I took it and flunked. But that is the only one I know of.

MR. NELSON (Brigham Young): Sometime ago we began developing a self-instructinal program, realizing it would be very difficult to handle 4,000 to 5,000 students in a formal instructional program. We first developed a video orientation presentation, which flunked. The English faculty agreed it would be too boring. Then we went to the instructional research and development people, who like to take a scientific approach. To our surprise, they recommended a very simple approach using an audio tape which could be taken by the student as he strolled around the library with a simple portable tape player. We followed that with some actual program instruction manuals, which a student uses himself. Much to our surprise, the instructional research and development people recommended a print presentation for the five other units that we presented or prepared. These have all been applied with psychological testing to determine their validity as self-instructional programs. I think we have enjoyed a considerable amount of success, at least in terms of a comparison between the pretest and the posttest, which shows some very favorable results.

MR. LUCKER (MIT): Probably a lot less money is going into the production of media than into instructional materials. At MIT, we have developed a lot of what are called "point-of-use devices," which are essentially instructional tape cassettes, or individual taped and printed materials. These were developed under the model library program. Most of these having to do with research in technical-geological indices are being revised right now.

Just this summer, through a grant from the Sloan Foundation, we produced a 30-minute vieotape on how to search patent literature. We are trying to hustle some more money from an institutional allied grant for our next project,

which is to produce a 30-minute instructional film on technical translations. We have decided to put all the effort, and whatever money we have, into this kind of bibliographical apparatus, that is, specific teaching tools, because more general materials on the use of the library have had very little success. We get nowhere trying to give mini-courses or courses for credit. But when we work on how to use the card catalog or how to search the record indices, we seem to get a pretty good return. That is where we are putting our money these days.

MS. SHERWOOD: I think you are merely adapting to the different student needs, and, at MIT, with its largely engineering curriculum, I suspect your TV approach is appropriate. The students do need to know about a particular type of index, and you are responding to that need. A fully developed library instruction program in a university should include point-of-use instruction for those who need to use particular tools at a particular time, but it should also include the other aspects of instruction that I talked about. I say this because we have seen that, although students can learn how to use one tool in one part of the library, they seldom develop a way of moving through the entire library, from beginning to end, researching a topic. That is where we are focusing our attention, that is why we have framed our instruction programs as we have. We are concerned with that total progress, not just parts of it.

SPEAKERS PANEL

MR. BOSS (Princeton): We would now like to ask the speakers who are still here to take part in a discussion of the overall question of library user success.

Harking back to yesterday, I had said that we have done a distinguished job in developing and maintaining collections, but that there was another side to that coin that we had been looking at. For those of you who prefer the first side of that coin, there is a program being developed on collection development for our October meeting. In fact, we had hoped we would have a very distinguished person here to flip that coin for us, Bob Vosper. We regret he cannot be here. The side of the coin we have been concentrating on these past two days is library user success. Can we identify the obstacles? Can we reduce the obstacles, so that those sources we have acquired will in fact be accessible to our users? We would like to get your general comments, and the general comments of our speakers, concerning how we might begin to pull this together into a cohesive program to improve library success.

An important component of this discussion, inasmuch as this meeting is under the auspices of the Association of Research Libraries, should be comments about what legitimate role the Association might play. Is that role primarily one of communication, passing information among us so that not every one of us need contact every other to find out what they are doing? One medium for this type of communication is the SPEC program. Does the Association have a role in sponsoring meetings like this? Does the Association have training roles, not only in training librarians, but perhaps even going beyond librarians? I am not attempting to recommend specific things, but rather to pose the question: What is that role, as you see it? The floor is open for comments or, if you like, questions on both additional aspects of library user access and the role of ARL particularly.

MR. LORENZ (ARL): I would like to take this opportunity to again strum one of my favorite themes, that is, communication among the members of ARL. You mentioned the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, which I think is very good for fairly concentrated topics. But there are also new developments coming along that should be announced just as soon as they happen, or as soon as there are findings, and I think the ARL Newsletter is readymade for sharing this kind of information. Just now, I was asking Mr. Lucker about the availability of some of the tools that MIT has developed for very specific purposes, and I am glad to say he will get in touch with us when he gets back and let us know about the availability of these tools to other members.

MR. PINGS (Wayne State): I am interested in microforms. When Mr. Spreitzer ended his talk, we were just at the point where we were going to start making paper copies of microforms. From my experience, this is where the real frustration occurs, especially in the kind of environment that my institution is in. In case you do not know, Wayne State is an inner city component of Detroit and everybody is scared to come into the inner city of Detroit. They want a copy of something, so they can take it out to the suburbs and read it. But there is no dependable way of making paper copies of microforms to get

this information out. There is some hope that manufacturers are going to do something about that, but if they do not, what kinds of pressure could this organization assert on whomever is going to produce these machines? Where do you start, or isn't that a problem?

MR. SPREITZER: That is a very big problem, and one that is exacerbated by the way our collections have grown. We need the greatest versatility in our equipment, but, when we consider the small market that exists and our inability to pay, our prospects for what we want are not good. Equipment that is really adequate for our purposes is not now on hand. But I don't think we can really speak in terms of pressure until we can provide the equipment manufacturers the proper encouragement in the way of sales. To be sure, the immediate future is not very bright. We have to be prepared to make very considerable investment in equipment that will alleviate our problems, but, even if we do, this will be the greatest obstacle to greater microfilm use in the next two to five years. A good solution to the problem at hand is not in sight, as far as I am concerned.

MR. BOSS: Let me add to that if I may. I think one ought to be careful not to just write off microfilms as an aspect of library service just because the technology is not ideally what one would wish. A good deal can be done to counteract negative attitudes if one can make microforms appear as much as possible to the user like hard copy, unless there is compelling reason to the contrary. If the microform copy machine is no greater distance from the microform collection that the xerox machines are from the books, that is one step in the right direction. If the price is the same that also helps. One is going to lose money selling hard copy from microform at five cents per copy, but it is interesting that, after lowering our price to five cents per copy, our losses were substantially lower than expected because the volume skyrocketed. Some of the maintenance problems we had had when the equipment was infrequently used are also disappearing. The staff is now developing some expertise with the equipment. Depending on some of the administrative decisions you make, you can take a marginal situation and make it very, very bad indeed. Or you can make it relatively tolerable. I think that your approach is very, very critical in dealing with this problem. Of course, if we have an opportunity as a group to influence the development of technology, so much the better.

MR. SPREITZER: Another thing that we could do is concentrate on developing specifications for more satisfactory equipment. Some library people have been working on the idea of developing better microfilm readers. That is not where the need is. We can live with what we have now. What we really need is recognition that we should move away from the concept of the reader/printer, so we can really concentrate on a printer that does not also pretend to be a machine used for reading. The last thing you want is to have a person using a $5,000 machine for reading. What you want is a coin machine which patrons can use simply by pushing a button. They should go elsewhere to do their work, thus leaving space for the next person. That is what we want, and we should undertake some risk to get it. We do not need to cling to the idea that one piece of equipment should do everything. Maybe we would be better off having two or three machines, each of which does its own job well and fast. There are various ways we could do it.

I don't want to sound like a voice of doom by any means, but I really

anticipate that, if we move as we seem to be, we will be facing much greater pressure for microform service, even though we are not very well equipped to provide it. Even so, we can make great strides forward providing better service with the typical microform materials that you have at the present time.

MR. JOSEY (New York State Library): Yesterday, in discussing interlibrary systems, you mentioned heirarchical versus geographical arrangements. In New York, we have a geographical and hierarchial system. I wonder, Hugh, if you would comment.

MR. ATKINSON (Ohio State): The first problem with hierarchical interlibrary loan arrangements is that they are simply an agreement made between libraries. When you have an electronically based system, it allows you to order directly, and it seems to me it is probably impossible to build that kind of hierarchical agreement into the system, itself. It could be done but the cost of the program would not be worth it. It might work if the screen at the acquiring library had a display showing the locations of items and the protocol demands the patron would have to use to get them. But it seems to me that won't be workable for every request. It will go to other locations.

With electronically based systems, you simply cannot enforce the kinds of hierarchial arrangements that we now do. Therefore, it seems to me you must rely on a much more decentralized, completely horizontal system, both for finding material and for developing the program and the electronics themselves. The degree of interdependency required by these electronic systems seems to preclude the possibility of any nationwide hierarchial system.

MR. SCHMIDT (SUNY Albany): I wanted to ask the group if it wishes to comment on what seems to be a subtle, but nonethelss gut, professional question. We are all familiar with what happens when we mechanize housekeeping routines. We can either pay for that mechanization by the labor resources that are released, or we can redeploy those resources to the service delivery end of our organization. Most of us probably do both of those. But the things we are talking about here are inevitably going to make the delivery of service more labor intensive than it has been. We are trying to make our operations more capital intensive and less labor intensive, but it looks as though we are going to make the delivery of service more labor intensive. The difficulty we are going to face stems from the fact that the labor force which is released by machines does what Drucker calls the "donkey work." But the skills of the released labor force are no match for the skills that are needed at the delivery end. I might be releasing X number of SG-3 clerks and typists because of the OCLC installation, but what I want them to do at the service delivery end is the kind of thing Virginia Sherwood is talking about. Friends, there is no way an SG-3 can go out and do that. Maybe what I need to do is free professional staff from the stationary service points in the library and replace them by paraprofessionals or clericals. This might release professionals to go out there into the delivery end. That, it seems to me, would force us to restructure the work that is done at the delivery end in much the same way we had to redesign what professional catalogers do in the OCLC environment. For myself, frankly, the question of restructuring work among varying categories of staff at the delivery end is more troublesome and more volatile than it was to figure out the same issues in the back room.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I think you have hit on a key issue, and I suspect most of us

are grappling with it. For about five years, we have been rotating staff from one public service department to another, from acquisitions to general reference, from one branch to another, and I guess the unit heads involved are now convinced that it is feasible to make these shifts. Even though the matches are not perfect, you can make do. But I don't think the real crunch has come yet. At some point, we are going to have to restructure jobs, and this is going to take a great deal of effort by both our employees and ourselves. I would imagine, in come cases, it is going to be rough sledding. For that reason I suspect that any library which is going into a data base like OCLC ought to be looking around now to see what the options are. We need to consider what flexibility we will need and what this means for the staff. Possibly, we should be thinking about ways to instruct not library users, but our own staff, to make these changes.

MR. ATKINSON: Attrition occurs so slowly among SG-3's that we are not really talking about a transition that is going to last two years, but one that is going to last twenty. I think we will have that kind of problem for that long. On top of that, I would suggest that, if there is a massive transfer of people from technical services to whatever part of public service is involved, it seems to call for a restructuring of the traditional library administrative structure. You simply cannot have one assistant director in charge of a machine and 22 people and another assistant director in charge of half a machine. It seems to me that what we are going to see is some kind of restructuring of both public and technical services with the change to a machine-intensive operation. The housekeeping functions, including circulation, strike me as less of a problem of organization. But, how one reorganizes the public services is a problem that should receive much more thought.

MR. DE GENNARO (Pennsylvania): My experience is that these changes take place over a period of time, and I have not had any particular difficulty where jobs have been phased out by attrition and we hired new people or people from other departments to do the new things that we want to do. For example, we set up a data base for the data services unit in our reference department in 1973, and I think that we created the position we needed in reference when someone retired in cataloging. These things take place over a period of years, and I think we should not be too alarmed at these sudden changes. They are not going to be sudden.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I don't disagree, but--

MR. DE GENNARO: You do, but you are too nice to say so.

MR. DOUGHERTY: It varies from library to library. If you are going to have cataloging people with a high attrition rate, you probably have no problems. But yesterday there were a number of comments related to the fact that we have created a bibliographical record that we may not really want. We created our own Frankenstein, I believe it was said, and a library that tries to dismantle that Frankenstein could well run into difficulties. I do not think you can make any generalization. It is a matter of each individual library.

MR. DE GENNARO: Circumstances alter all cases.

MR. MC DONALD (Connecticut): The problem still exists.

MR. BOSS: I think it is important to stress that this umbrella of efforts aimed at library user access has many different components. One reason for pulling it together under the umbrella is that I do not believe we have had a high level of institutional awareness of how our users are doing. No one seems to be charged with measuring their success and saying, "Hey, we have got some obstacles out here and we have got to do something." Once having determined what those obstacles are, the tasks of addressing them will vary. In some cases they will involve new activity. They may be quite expensive. They may involve the reallocation of employees and financial resources. In some cases, they may require the same people to do the same level work, but do it differently.

If we can look at our concerns in the broader sense of library user access but then solve the problems in terms of their specific component requirements, we may be able to accomplish a great deal without a major reallocation of resources, without major reorganization. As we are successful in those simpler tasks, we may begin to develop the boldness to take on some of the more difficult and challenging tasks, including that dismantling project that we talked about.

The question, however--and I am under a charge from top level management not to let you get out the doors without answering it--is, "What do you perceive as appropriate roles for the Association of Research Libraries?" May we have questions specifically addressed to that?

MR. ANDERSON (Colorado State): At the risk of alluding to some sweeping generalizations, it seems to me we have talked about microforms, we have talked about document delivery, we have talked about decentralized-centralized circulation systems, we have talked about replacements, we have talked about RLG, and all of these things are very interesting, but there is one element in the research process, namely, evaluation, that we haven't talked very much about. What is happening to these students?

Richard mentioned his experience a little bit, but, as far as I can see, one of the really true contributions that ARL can make is in the research area. ALA sure as hell is not doing anything about it. To bring it together in some way under the umbrella of this Association, it seems to me, would be a very great, genuine contribution. After all, this is an Association of Research Libraries. It would seem to me the libraries themselves should be interested in research about themselves.

MS. ACKERMAN (UCLA): I think what I have to say is related to what Lee said, and it is also related to a theme that seems to have run through the meeting for the last two days. We have been talking about various obstacles to access, bibliographic and physical, and, although we haven't actually said it, there are many times we have implied that faculty members are one of the major obstacles to all of the things we want to do. Beyond that, we have implied that librarians are among the major obstacles to the things we perceive as solutions or alternatives. One thing it seems to me ARL could do is develop a research capacity. We might involve organizations such as ACE or MLA in the design of the research and in the evaluation of results, because the proof of the pudding of library access is not really to be found by librarians, it is to be found by faculty members in the performance of students. We really haven't talked about that at all, except in passing.

MR. BOSS: Yes, that is right.

MR. ATKINSON: While I tend to agree with the role of evaluation, I do caution that one of the reasons for ARL's success has been its smallness. Any urges to expand the size of the permanent staff strikes me as a dangerous one.

MS. ACKERMAN: Hugh, that is not my presentation at all.

MR. ATKINSON: Oh, I realize that.

MR. SPARKS (Notre Dame): I think ARL could help us work with our administration to convince the accrediting associations that they should measure the effectiveness of library support at our institutions in terms of "access" rather than "ownership." I think a great deal of difficulty comes from the fact that they have traditionally measured support by the amount of material we own. This leads to great strains in our relationships with each other and our relationships with developing national networks.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I didn't have an opportunity to sit on the Role of the Research Library roundtable, so I don't know what was discussed. But if, indeed, ARL places more emphasis on access, if it tries to achieve a better balance between the utilization of resources and the building of collections, I think it would be reasonable for ARL to concentrate on and review, with such agencies as ACE, the role of the research library.

MR. MC DONALD: If what I am hearing suggests that the ARL/CRL Standards Committee has not completed its work, if that is the meaning of what Mr. Sparks just said, then what does the organization want? Do you want specifications for research libraries that embrace all of these activities? I have been working on standards with this organization since 1965, and I do not think we are any closer to them than we were when we started. We really ought to decide whether we want these standards. If the tone of this meeting is what I think it is, it seems to me that we do want them. If so, we ought to get on with it. I don't know whether that is germane, but I felt like saying it.

MR. DE GENNARO: I would just like to comment on Page Ackerman's remarks and to direct my comments to anyone else who has talked about the need for evaluation. I think I would just like to caution us that most of what you heard in the last two days is pretty pragmatic stuff. It is, at least, in my case. It is not terribly scientific, and I have no pretense that it is. We are just trying various things to improve access and services, and I doubt very much that we could (or should) get down, measure, and count all of these things and come up with evaluations that would be in any way meaningful.

MS. PERRY (Rochester): I tend to disagree with you, primarily because, when you measure yourself, you convince people who support you that it is important. If your administration looks at salaries and is willing to sacrifice service to get them up to where they look good in the book, if that is the game they are going to play, then I think we should not be naive and should play it just as well.

MR. AXFORD (Oregon): I have to disagree a little bit with this evaluation, because I think Page Ackerman has really hit it on the head. There are places

where courses or credits are being offered for interdisciplinary research in this kind of testing and evaluation. If, for instance, you had half of a class in an English department taking a three-hour library course and the other half not taking the class, there are certainly people on the campus who could produce valid data on whether people taking that course performed better in the manner in which Page was talking about. I agree that we don't need to baloon ARL Headquarters to do that, but there must be some way in which the Association could encourage those of you who have the opportunity to do that kind of research. There may even be possibilities for ARL to act as an intermediary between funding agencies and places that would undertake that research in cooperation with behavioral people.

MR. BOSS: I think our time is exhausted, but, if I have the correct sense of what has been said, there appears to be a role for ARL in coordinating teaching research, in exchanging information through SPEC and the Newsletter, and in providing a link to other organizations, ACE being most prominently mentioned. There is also the question of, "Do we have a collective view of what is an appropriate standard to determine whether a library is effective?" Is that standard collection-based? Is it user-success based? Is it a combination of these two? If that is a correct sense, I think it more than fills the agenda of the board meeting, and I hope that Ed Lathem's wishes are satisfied.

MR. LATHEM: Surely, I want to say to the Chairman of the Program Committee that, by virtue of the vigorous applause to the individual segments of what has been placed before us yesterday and today, we have had an opportunity to indicate our appreciation of, and our gratitude for, the individual presentations in the program that he has organized and over which he has presided. But I am sure that all of your colleagues of the Association, Richard, want an opportunity to give direct expression to you of their indebtedness and heartiest thanks.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Library Users Weren't Born That Way

Dr. Mark Curtis

MR. BOSS: Ladies and gentlemen, we were attempting to find, using a random sampling process, a typical library user. We failed. We turned up rather a typical one, one with twenty years, or a little bit more, as an undergraduate student and doctoral student at Yale University, then, for more than a decade, as a faculty member and an associate graduate fellow, for more than a decade as President of Scripps College. Throughout much of this time, he was a consultant to the Folger Shakespeare Library, and, subsequently, he became a consultant to the New York Public Library. We have a rather a typical library user to tell us that library users weren't born that way.

Mark Curtis is our very special guest tonight. We are very happy to have him talk with us tonight to give us his perceptions of what our users are all about.

DR. MARK CURTIS: I was going to make a statement that, although I was here as a representative of library users, I was not a typical library user, and I probably cannot represent, in what I say, a majority of library users. I confess, however, that I have been, am now, and will continue to be a habitual user of libraries. I grew up in a family of omnivorous readers, and I was probably introduced to libraries by an older sister who haunted the public library of the county seat down in Iowa where we lived. I know, on the afternoon when she was in charge of her considerably younger brother, that that is the way we often spent our time. In any event, I became hooked on libraries before I reached my teens, and, subsequently, I have traveled thousands of miles and crossed oceans for no other purpose than to work in libraries. The only extended hiatus from being in libraries I have ever had in my life occurred in the twelve years that I was a college president. Even then, though I had little time for using libraries. I still had a lot to do with the building and operating of them.

I am also pleased to acknowledge that, just as I have spent my happiest hours in libraries, I have found some of my most valued friends among librarians. Recently I have been involved in a special consulting assignment with one of the major independent research libraries of the country, and I have learned that the qualities that I cherish in my longstanding librarian friends are shared widely among the members of the whole tribe. Of course, librarians, like other professionals, always have to bear a cross of being stereotyped by those who do not know them intimately. I want to assure you that I find these stereotypes, like most stereotypes, reflections of the banality and ignorance of their beholders, not of the persons about whom they are held. Who could think of librarians as the epitome of Caspar Milquetoasts or Walter Mittys if he had ever known that varsity vagabond, Larry Powell, and heard him play the jazz piano? And who could classify them as dry-as-dusts if he had once been regaled with southern stories by that premier raconteur, Louis Wright?

As a library user I have also had my favorites among the libraries I have known. I learned first about research libraries and the riches they contain in the Sterling Library at Yale. Even as an undergraduate I worked in the valuable collections of French Revolutionary newspapers it contains. Ironically, my fondness for that imposing pile was only heightened one day by observing a nearsighted elderly woman enter its main doors and begin to do the stations of the cross as she proceeded from Gothic pillar to Gothic pillar down its nave-like great hall toward the delivery desk at the other end. My preferred places to read and study, however, are a library in England and another here at home. Romantic that I am, I find the Duke Humphrey Library at Oxford and the Folger Shakespear Library in Washington the ones I rate above all others. Not far below them in my estimation comes the Henry E. Huntington Library in San Marino.

The mention of these libraries brings me to the point of departure for dealing with the theme of my remarks this evening. Aside from my romantic nature, my preference for these libraries arises from the fact that they provide what I consider ideal conditions for library users. In the Folger and the Huntington I can have available for my use any item from their collections when I want access to it. As a consequence, when I was a faculty member at UCLA, and this is no disparagement to you and the UCLA Library, Page, I found it worth my while to drive at least once a week for an hour and a half each way to work at the Huntington in San Marino. I could get more accomplished in that one day than I could in three or four spent in the university library in Westwood.

As I recall from my past, I recognize that the Folger and Huntington do not differ in significant respects from most other research libraries. They are specialized libraries whose collections happen to correspond in scope with my interests as a historian of the Tudor and Stuart periods. Furthermore, these libraries also refuse to allow items in their collections to circulate. They can, therefore, provide immediate access to all books and manuscripts except for the occasional one which is either at the bindery or undergoing some special treatment for purposes of conservation. Even when an item is being used by another reader it is in the library, and a person requesting access to it may find out who has it and make arrangements to share its use in a way that is mutually agreeable.

Yet, having acknowledged this difference as one which, under present circumstances, significantly distinguishes the Folger and Huntington from other research libraries, I still wonder whether it is not possible to devise means by which most research libraries can offer the same advantages to their users that these libraries provide for me. Now, before you dismiss me as an impossible dreamer or, what in your mind may be closer to the truth, an incendiary who, by holding out unrealizable expectations to library users, will stir their suppressed frustration and hostility into raging militancy, let me discuss some of the possibilities and prospects that lie before us, at least as I see them from my perspective. From my point of view, the most promising development under way among research libraries is the movement to build networks of libraries such as the Research Library Group in the Northeast and the cooperative system being organized by Berkeley and Stanford on the West Coast. Even though the full

fruit of these efforts may not be available to us for some years to come, I believe that, when the harvest is in, they will provide advantages of access to library users of the kind now available only in specialized libraries.

Before library users can enjoy the benefits of these developments, of course, there are a number of technical and organizational problems to be overcome. You know these better than I and are better qualified than I to deal with them. Yet, I would respectfully suggest that none of these is the chief roadblock hindering orderly progress toward the establishment of workable networks of research libraries. The major problem is conceptual, and, hence, the fundamental prerequisite for further advances in this movement is acceptance by users, librarians, and university administrators of a new concept and definition of a research library. The definition I have in mind seems to me implicit in the movement, but it needs to be made explicit so that it can be consciously and deliberately adopted by policy-makers and thus put to full use in the planning and development that will make future library services as effective as possible.

Traditionally, a research library has been defined as a comprehensive collection which preserves, as nearly as possible, the total record of human thought, emotion, and deeds, and that is systematically organized to facilitate full and accurate discovery, analysis, evaluation, and interpretation of the recorded data. Such a collection is to be supported by an aquisitions policy that would judge the desirability of adding an item to the holdings only by the potential need of research workers. The ideal that such a library was to approach, even if it could not realize it completely, was to hold every record, publication or reference item that any user might conceivably require now or in the future and to produce it on the premises of the library on demand.

It is obvious, of course, that no library, even ones as large and ancient as the Bodleian, the British Library, the Biblioteque Nationale, or the Vatican has ever attained that ideal. Yet, until very recently, this concept of a research library has hardly been questioned. It has, almost without exception, been instrumental in determining library policies, especially for our major universities and foundations like the New York Public Library. In Sir Francis Bacon's terms, it has been an "idol of the cave" that gave a firm set to the thinking of both library users and librarians. In the 1950's, a few voices sounding like prophets crying in the wilderness began to challenge such traditional thinking. But they were largely unheeded as universities, after Sputnik, benefitted from an unprecedented outpuring of both public and private support for their programs and research facilities. Only now, in the late 1970's, does the time seem ripe to heed the message of such prophets and to translate it into reality.

Among librarians, to be sure, a new definition is being discussed, but it is not fully accepted. Last fall, at a conference in Pittsburgh on resource sharing in libraries, almost everyone present agreed that the time had come for the distributed library. A report of this conference that I happened to see stated that "there was much--but not complete--agreement that the criterion of ownership is yielding to one of access" and that, as William Welsh said, "The great independent research library is a castle in sand." Similar thinking underlies the initiation and development of the

Research Libraries Group.

In a speech given at the University of Michigan on April 4, 1975, Douglas Bryant of Harvard stated that the four libraries comprising the RLG "accepted the proposition that the building of research collections of distinction can no longer be an independent enterprise but, rather, must be a group responsibility". Under these circumstances I am emboldened to offer my own definition of a research library of the future, not because I have any original thoughts on the matter but because I do not know of any complete definition that brings together the various strands of thought that are becoming current among persons concerned with library problems.

The definition that I propose reads: A research library is a major organized institutional unit in a network of libraries and other facilities for the storage and retrieval of information and is a principal point of access within that network to enable scholars and other users to discover and attain full, accurate data for subsequent analysis, evaluation, and interpretation. To operate effectively, it does not need a comprehensive collection in all fields, but it does need a stock of publications and materials that will satisfy 75 to 80 percent of the requirements of its local users. Some of this basic stock should probably be in multiple copies. It needs comprehensive collections only in those fields for which it shall undertake responsibility to supply the needs of the network, by mutual agreement with members of the network. It also needs an assured means of providing local users access to items in other collections held by the network within a reasonable time.

To designate and emphasize that a principal characteristic of a research library is to be a point of access to, rather than a storage facility for, the total record of human thought, emotion, and deeds, suddenly but profoundly changes priorities among the fundamental functions of a library. Acquiring and accessing new items in a collection will still be significant parts of a research library's mission, but they will be subordinate to the provisions and maintenance of catalogs, bibliographical aids, comprehensive reference services, and delivery systems that will assist users in locating and procuring access to any items held by the network of which the library is a part. I shall not list or comment on the consequences of this definition for matters such as acquisitions of serials and monographs, costs of conservation, and the provision of stacks and storage space. These are subjects to which you librarians have already given much thought, and your thought is reflected in a growing body of literature to which I am not competent to add anything. But, from the standpoint of a user, I dare predict that such a change in the content and definition of a research library will bring all research libraries within approachable distance of the ideal conditions which users have hitherto enjoyed only in specialized libraries like the Folger and the Huntington.

To demonstrate my conviction about this point, let me reiterate something I said last fall when I was a guest at a meeting of the Directors of the Research Library Group at Seven Springs Farm. A question had arisen at that meeting about whether an agreement to assign a specific responsibility for acquiring a comprehensive collection in a given field to a single library within a network would prevent, or at least handicap, the faculties using

other libraries within the network from developing advanced studies in that field. I took the position then, and I still hold it firmly, that a system like the RLG would not restrict opportunities for advanced studies and research to those fields for which a university library might hold the comprehensive collections for the network. Indeed, I felt, and I still do, that participation in the network would free a university from the limitations of its own library resources and make it possible for its faculty to decide whether it should pursue advanced studies in various fields on grounds of academic principles and reasons that it deemed sound and important to the academic programs of their institution. In other words, the redefinition of the research library, and the incorporation of it within a viable network, would not only extend the access of the users but contribute to the more vigorous and free pursuit of knowledge at the highest level.

If I wanted to extend these remarks, it would be appropriate here to mention the ways in which we might develop networks that are small enough to be manageable yet large enough to provide the kind of access I am talking about. It might be appropriate, in another context, to talk about the need for a national institution like the Library of Congress to provide essential services to all regional groups. But these are technical questions that I should better leave to you. I want to continue to talk about what all of this means to the user, and I will return to this point momentarily. For, although what I have propounded is not new, I do believe it holds out the possibility of giving the user the advantages that I enjoy when I go to the specialized libraries that I like to work in.

Now, vital as the new type of research library would be to library users, I think another policy is also important. The policy I have in mind is of such a character that it could be put into effect almost immediately, and its speedy adoption would also, in due course, prepare research libraries to be more effective parts of the networks of which they ultimately will become a part. The policy to which I refer is one that would restrict circulation of items in library collections. Ideally, I favor a policy of non-circulation, but I realize the unacceptability, if not impracticality of such a drastic measure. I would therefore propose a policy placing much more severe restrictions on circulation than now generally prevail, perhaps granting overnight circulation for the most frequently used items and then degrees of circulation for others that are less frequently used. In no case would I allow even the most senior and prestigious faculty member to have unlimited circulation for a volume.

In order to be effective, of course, such restrictions would have to apply to faculty, as well as to other users, and, even as I say this, I know of nothing more likely to provoke a faculty to revolt than a unilateral action withdrawing--or seriously curbing--its special privileges to keep books and periodicals in members' offices for an indefinite period. I used to do it myself. Success in such an effort could only come through a vigorous campaign in which the administration might play a part in persuading the faculty, or the larger part of that body, that the increased availability of all items in the library would vastly improve their access to them. A possible means for overcoming faculty resistance--and there may be others that are much more feasible--would be to exchange their present

privileges for a right to check out items for use in their library carrels for an indefinite period. Then, other users could have access to them when the faculty members were not using the library. If such a right carried with it a privilege of overnight, or some other limited period of circulation, for such items, it might conceivably bring the best of both worlds.

A technical development might greatly facilitate constant availability of items being used in carrels and studies. If the stations for the automated circulation systems could be placed in a convenient location in the stacks, then a record of who had removed an item from the stacks to his carrel or study could be immediately transmitted to the circulation data bank and could be there for ready reference of other users.

In these brief remarks, and they have been intended to be illustrative and suggestive rather than comprehensive, my purpose this evening has been to make suggestions aimed at enhancing library user access. Now that I am nearing the end of my comments and can reflect on them a bit, I fear that I have proven what I said at the beginning about not being a typical library user. I fear that these remarks do not represent majority opinion among library users. Few of my suggestions would find wide acceptance among members of any faculty club known to me. And such skepticism by my colleagues raises, even in me, the question used as the title for this speech "Are Library Users Born That Way?".

My answer, despite myself, must, on the whole, be favorable to library users. On the whole, they are a reasonable lot. Oh, they have a fair share of inborn self-interest and perhaps a relatively low threshhold of impatience and frustration, but they also have a normal desire to get along amicably with their fellow men--even librarians and university administrators. What is wrong with library users is not that they are different from other people but that they are, despite their high intelligence, so much like other people. Their minds, like those of other people, are susceptible to the influence of idols of the cave, and they find it hard to conceive of libraries being truly libraries if they differ in concepts and basic function from those that they have traditionally known. For most users, in other words, ownership is still the sine qua non of access.

Part of what is required to change their attitude, and perhaps to win their support, on faculty library committees, in faculty meetings, and in the faculty senate is an appeal to reason grounded on an easily discernible functional principle. As my final suggestion, therefore, I shall try to offer such a principle. It underlies all that I have said heretofore. In speaking to the advantages I found at the Folger and the Huntington, I said that I could have available for my use any item from their collections when I wanted access to it. My suggestion, therefore, is that availability, rather than ownership, is the key to access. Indeed, ownership is only one means of making an item available. In other words, the basic rationale for networks, such as those predicated by the new definition I have stated, is that they extend and enhance availability and therefore improve access.

In a similar way, the fundamental reason for restricted circulation is the effect of that policy on availability of library items. If they are in

the library rather than in someone's office or study at home, they are available to potential users more hours of the day more days of the week and more weeks of the year than otherwise. If I am right, the test question for judging the desirability of a plan or policy for libraries and their users in the future will be, "How will this plan or policy affect the availability of research materials for a user?" Decisions made in response to that question will, I am sure, so improve access in the long run that even the most skeptical among faculty users will reluctantly, but inevitably, come to accept the new ways.

BUSINESS MEETING

Amendment to the ARL By Laws

MR. LATHEM (Dartmouth): The first item on the agenda is a proposed amendment to the Bylaws of the Association involving Article IV, Section 2. For the purpose of placing this before the membership for discussion and action, the amendment will be moved by a member of the Board of Directors, and then the question will be open for debate and action. I recognize Mrs. Whitney for the proper purpose of proposing this amendment.

MS. WHITNEY (Rutgers): I would like to move the amendment and then speak to it briefly, if I may, Mr. President. I move a change in Article IV, Section 2, as follows: It shall be the duty of the Nominating Committee to select annually as many nominees for the Board of Directors as there are vacancies on the Board to fill. No Director, having served a three-year term, may be nominated to succeed himself or herself. The consent of the candidates to serve, if elected, must be obtained before nominations are accepted. The report of the Nominating Committee shall be distributed to the members at least 30 days before the election.

Additional nominations may be made from the floor.

I move the adoption of this amendment.

. . . The motion was seconded . . .

MR. LATHEM: The motion is made and seconded. Ms. Whitney will make a preliminary statement on behalf of the Board.

MS. WHITNEY: This matter was brought to the attention of the Board by several members of the Association after the election last year. The Board has brought it up for your consideration without any recommendation either for or opposed.

MR. LATHEM: We are now ready for discussion. Is there discussion?

MR. STAM (Johns Hopkins): Does that mean that a person cannot serve two consecutive terms? Does it mean one cannot succeed himself but might succeed in someone else's vacancy?

MR. LATHEM: Is there a response to that from Ms. Whitney?

MS. WHITNEY: I believe it means you may not serve two successive terms. If you were filling out someone's vacancy, I believe we have always regarded that differently.

MR. LATHEM: The Chair's understanding is that it alters nothing except the number of nominees put forward for election. The circumstances which have obtained in the past with reference to succession would continue. Is there further discussion?

[The question was called and a vote taken.]

MR. LATHEM: The Chair rules that clearly those in favor have it and the amendment is passed [See Appendix A for revised Bylaws]

* * *

Report of the Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

MR. DUNLAP (Iowa): The Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books is a small committee. There are four of us. There were five, but we lost Ray Frantz, who went to higher and more important things. The four of us are Herbert Finch, William Cagle, John Finzi and myself, and Suzanne Frankie has met with us. We had our most recent meeting at Cornell University on April 22nd.

We were concerned with three topics at that meeting. First, it was brought to our attention that some dealers are now offering Winslow Homer prints for sale and that they are able to supply a great many on demand. We didn't want to feel that we were impotent. We felt we ought to do something about this. As a result, we recommended to the ARL Board that our Executive Director be requested to work with the FBI to see where these were acquired and what could be done about it. Not only is there a dealer in Kent, Ohio, who is advertising these prints, there is another one in Marquesas Island, Florida. There may be others. I believe the Board has approved our recommendation so something will probably be done in this direction.

Secondly, we talked at great legnth about security problems. This is a very complicated subject, of course, because you do not know sometimes what you have lost, and, even if you do know, you cannot identify it. The Society of American Archivists now compiles a register of missing material, but this will serve only for individual manuscripts. It is not going to help when you can't authenticate the copy of a book. Also, you may not know an individual manuscript is gone. Perhaps you can't identify it anyway. But, at least something is being done in this area.

Our committee is much concerned about doing more in the area of security for special collections. We expect to meet in October with representatives from the Society of American Archivists and with Clyde Walton, Chairman of the Manuscripts Committee of ACRL, to see if we can't come up with some notions about the appropriate amount of electronic equipment and other security measures for libraries of various sizes. People don't talk about their security arrangements, because, of course, you don't want to divulge them to people who may take advantage of them. This Association doesn't provide any advisory service in this area, and it certainly should. The Society of American Archivists will now furnish you a list of consultants. Why doesn't ARL do the same thing? We are not sure where we are going to come out, but we are going to address ourselves to this topic.

We have also been working on the Short Title Catalog project of eighteenth century imprints. This is a very confused topic. Doug Bryant, who is a member of the governing board, Rudy Rogers, who attended a meeting in London last summer, and several others are better able to talk about it than I am. I understand this project was proposed as early as 1962, but nothing was done about it, because the British Library reorganization took so much energy and effort that people in the British Museum and elsewhere had no time to devote to this particular topic. Last year, a group meeting in London appointed a governing and a drafting committee, and these groups have taken some preliminary stands that, to me, are sometimes questionable. For instance, it has been determined that the catalog will include publications issued in the British Isles regardless of language, but, for other parts of the world, only publications in English will be included. I think we would be better served if they kept it to English worldwide or kept it to all languages worldwide. I hate to think of a short title catalog for Eighteenth Century Imprints in our own country that is going to skip the German and the Spanish and the Dutch and the rest, but that is where we are.

As recently as last summer, the group planned to publish information on 500,000 imprints in this catalog. Now they say there will be a million. I don't know why there is that much of a discrepancy in six months. The present plan, and it has now been launched, is to recatalog the estimated 300,000 eighteenth century imprints in the British Library in marc format. These 300,000 titles in marc format will then become the base to which other libraries can add. The planners have been permissive about the participation of libraries, but it seems that the prime collections in this country, the ones of most consequence, are those at Harvard, Yale, the New York Public Library, and the American Antiquarian Society. If this actually be the case, I think this organization should make an effort to see the holdings in those libraries listed and not worry so much about some of the rest of it. I could be wrong.

There are no figures as to price at this point. I don't see how they expect to go very far without getting into the budget process, but they have not done so. There is a suggestion that, one of these days, ARL will be asked for an endorsement, because there may be requests for some grants. I cannot believe this is going to happen very soon, although I was told it will happen. We will probably be asked to support them sometime in the next year.

My informant tells me they hope to recatalog the 300,000 titles in the British Museum in three years. I don't expect that will happen. I don't know how they can catalog 100,000 Eighteenth Century books in a year without the resources that I doubt they have.

One thing I would like to recommend to the librarians in this room, is that they begin now to make some listing of the Eighteenth Century works in their own collections. I think it is well worth doing, partly because you would then have your records in order for participation in the STC project if and when the information is wanted. But this would also give you a better sense of security, because you could segregate materials in your bibliography readily and you would have bibliographical access to these materials. You should know, too, that this is not so massive an undertaking as it may seem.

Seven years ago, at Cornell, they culled their shelves. They had 1400 trays to search, for a collection containing about three and one-half million volumes. It took only 700 hours to cull the 1400 trays, that is, two trays per hour. If these figures hold up for our collection of two million volumes, we can certainly get it done in 500 hours or so. Once you have identified every eighteenth century book in your collection, you can make sure these volumes are sent off to the special collections department. The Cornell experience indicated they could make two xeroxed copies of each shelf list card, pulled at the rate of 200 an hour. These xeroxes can then be filed both in chronological order and under some other heading. This is about the easiest device I can imagine for getting this material off our shelves before people steal it, and, at the same time, it provides chronological access, lets you know what you have in your collections, and leaves you in a position to help the STC people if and when they want our help.

I don't mean to speak in a derogatory manner about STC, because it is a great project. If you think of something costing $25 an entry--and you are talking about a million entries--you are talking about a mighty handsome sum of money. I do not have any idea where this will come from or when it will get done, but progress is being made.

* * *

Report of the Task Force on National Library Network Development

MR. DOUGHERTY (U. Cal. Berkeley): I do not have a great deal to report. We met last fall to discuss the issues and produced the paper which has been distributed to the membership [See Appendix B]. Based on the two roundtable discussions of yesterday, I would say the issues outlined in that paper are still valid but overly abstract. The Task Force met again this noon, and I have the following to report:

There is both confusion and great interest surrounding the report of the NCLIS Task Force on a National Periodicals Center. It is apparent that we need further enlightenment on that topic, even though the periodicals service was not part of our Task Force charge. The question of how a national network relates to bibliographical and actual resources is certainly an interrelationship that was not envisioned when the task force was appointed.

Another question we are discussing is, "What role could ARL play in fostering, endorsing, and lobbying for centers of excellence that might help the Library of Congress to distribute the cataloging load?" It is a complex issue, and we really have not sorted that out.

A third issue is ARL's involvement in efforts by the Library of Congress to plan a national network. Last April I met for the first time with the LC planning group, and that meeting was sort of an indoctrination for me as an observer for ARL. The LC group spent that meeting revising the planning document that was distributed to the membership, which is called the "March version" of the planning. It was my personal assessment that not much of the philosophy and the thrust of the document was changed. There was some

tugging and pulling between a central planning effort and a regional planning effort, but I think efforts are moving along. I think ARL should be particularly interested in how the bibliographic component--the access to data--will relate to actual resources. This planning group is not spending a great deal of time on that particular issue, but I think this issue will be of paramount importance to this Association in the next year or two.

I think, at this point, the Task Force is still in the process of sorting out the issues surrounding a national network. We are deciding, first, whether we should participate, and second, what our specific role should be if we do. With that, I will entertain questions.

MR. PINGS (Wayne State): Are the people you have talked to within ARL really interested in participating in a national network, or is there an important distinction there?

MR. DOUGHERTY: All of our discussions suggest we are talking about ARL's role and participation in a national network.

MR. PINGS: ARL as an association, or individual members participating?

MR. DOUGHERTY: Individual members would participate, but we are considering what role ARL might play to foster development of the network. If I am mischaracterizing our deliberations, I hope some member of the Task Force will correct me.

* * * *

Report of the Executive Director

MR. LORENZ: Since we all said farewell to Alexandria last October, there have been many developments in Washington relating to libraries. I am very pleased to bring you right up to date, initially, by telling you that, because of the good work many of you have done, and because of the many contacts we have made in Washington, I had direct and authoritative word from Washington yesterday that the House Appropriations Labor-HEW Subcommittee, chaired by Republican Daniel Flood of Pennsylvania, will include $3 million in the appropriations bill to get Title II-C moving. Better than that, Senator Eagleton, who is a member of the Senate Appropriations Labor-HEW Subcommittee, has announced that when the matter comes before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, he will move to have the amount increased to $15 million. This is, as you know, the maximum amount authorized for Fiscal 1978 under Title II-C.

I think this is truly extraordinary progress for this legislation. I thought I would be standing here telling you all the reasons why we were not making this kind of progress. It is a new program. No amount was included in the Carter budget revision, primarily because it is a new program and new programs are not being funded this year, generally. Also, I have learned that there is a great deal of competition for funds on Capitol Hill. Most members of the subcommittees are already lined up to support appropriations

for legislation which has been on the books for many, many years. So, we must somehow have pressed the right buttons some place, because we seem on the verge of success in spite of the obstacles.

Now, as you know, there can be many slips twixt this kind of initial action and a final appropriation, so, I do think it behooves all of you who have sent expressions of support to key members of Congress to reinforce that support and thank them for whatever assistance they have given us so far. I think, at this point, we should also extend our sights to the full Appropriations Subcommittees of both the House and Senate. On the House side, particularly, Appropriations is a very large, full committee with representatives from almost every state. When you get back to your offices on Monday, it would be wise to follow up with members that you have contacted--or with other people you know who have influence with key Congressmen. We now need to encourage them to support the initial breakthrough we seem to have made in this appropriation matter.

I think it is tremendously significant that, if we can get funds for fiscal 1978, it will, in effect, be the first time the Federal Government has recognized through its appropriations process that federal assistance for strengthening research library resources and services is truly in the national interest. I believe the effort to get this kind of attention and recognition has been going on for a long time. For example, we based some of our statements on what the Carnegie Corporation had said some years back on research libraries. We based them on what the American Council on Education had to say about research libraries and their importance. We based them on what the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science had said about research libraries being the key to development of any national plan for library and information services. So, I think we are getting recognition for the first time for the national importance of research libraries.

Since we are now moving forward on II-C appropriations, the regulations under Title II-C become more important than ever. Thus, I am especially pleased that Dick Hays of the Office of Education, who has now been appointed Director of the Office of Library and Learning Resources, is with us today, and I would like to ask him to give us the latest information on the status of regulations under Title II-C.

MR. HAYS: We decided that if you could get the money, we would adopt the regulations, and everyone thought that would be a fair trade. So, let me describe the process we go through in making regulations these days.

Several months ago, the Department of HEW put out what is called a "Notice of Intent to Publish Regulations." This appeared in the Federal Register in November. Altogether, the Notice called for comments on seven issues related to II-C, such as, "What is a major research library?" and "How restrictive do you make that definition?" Since November, we have received 45 comments, and, based on these comments, we are now going through the final process of putting together what are called "Proposed Rules." These wind through an elaborate process in the bureaucracy, where they have been tied up for some time, but they will probably be published next month

as Proposed Rules. After the Proposed Rules are published, there will be a 45-day period for comments. With the Proposed Rules you will be seeing in the Federal Register what you may be living with in terms of the administration of the statute. You can see the funding criteria, you can see what regionalization is, and it is very important that you all take a good look at those rules when they are published. As I say, there will be a 45-day period for comment, but we hope to come out with final regulations in September, just in time for the new fiscal year.

MR. LORENZ: I think getting something started in 1978 would certainly improve the prospects for fiscal 1979. I think there would have been real hope, in any event, that the present administration will include an amount for Title II-C of the Higher Education Act in its fiscal 1979 budget. We know that we now have a Commissioner of Education, Ernest Boyer, who has a real understanding and interest in research libraries, and we do feel that getting an amount included in the Administration's budget greatly enhances the prospects for getting an appropriation. So, we have that prospect to look forward to in fiscal 1979. We must also recognize that fiscal 1979 is the last year of the three years of the authorization for this legislation. So, depending on what we can begin building in 1978, we will have more or less ground for seeking an extension of the legislation beyond fiscal 1979.

Are there any questions that any of you would like to ask about Title II-C, its possible administration, or the timetable of action that will surround it?

From the ARL office, we will continue to keep you informed as subsequent actions take place on both the House and Senate sides of the Congress. If it does come to pass that the House approves three million dollars and the Senate goes for $15 million, the bill would go into a conference committee of the House and Senate. If developments follow the usual pattern for appropriations matters, the two houses would then split the difference 50-50, and we would end up with $9 million for fiscal 1978. Even that is not a bad level to start at, of course.

MR. WELSH (Library of Congress): Sometimes we regard ourselves as a research library, and, lest your remarks in the record be misunderstood, I think it would be better to understand that the Congress has supported research libraries for a number of years, beginning with the PL-480 program and then more recently with the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging, which, interestingly enough, was funded under II-C of the Higher Education Act, the same authorization for this $3 million program we are now discussing.

MR. LORENZ: I should have clarified my remarks. I was referring to the fact that this was the first time a federal agency would make direct grants to research libraries. As far as I know this has not happened before.

MR. TREZZA (NCLIS): Just for clarification, the definition of research libraries does include public libraries and state libraries as well as academic research libraries.

MR. LORENZ: Those libraries of a research nature.

MR. DE GENNARO (Pennsylvania): John, is there any part of that money that could be used for a national periodicals library?

MR. LORENZ: I think we would not really know until we see the regulations, but I do not see anything in the legislation that precludes a consortium of research libraries applying jointly for funding--particularly on a project like the development of a periodicals library. But, we will have to wait for the proposed regulations. I think the normal process in the administration of Title II-C will be for those libraries that feel they are of a research character to submit proposals to the Office of Education for funding under Title II-C. The Office of Education would then set up a mechanism for the evaluation of these proposals. Regardless of the outcome of the evaluation of those proposals, the Office would be limited to making grants of appropriated funds to no more than 150 research libraries.

MR. BOSS (Princeton): I am very much impressed that, through work and effort, we have managed to come this far. I think it materially important, though, that we do extra work on this particular legislation, even if we succeed in getting the full $15 million.

As a result of your efforts, I, among others, called a number of the legislators. When I did this, the title of the bill appeared to be a distinct obstacle, because it seemed to suggest that this was special interest legislation for research libraries. Time and time again it was necessary to point out that this legislation is really designed to make it possible for research libraries to continue to serve all the libraries of the country in an effective way. Because there was little, if any, knowledge or understanding of this particular legislation on the part of the constituent librarians of many of these Congressmen, we also had a dickens of a time getting support. I suggest that ARL, through its executive officers and through its individual members, do everything possible to promote this legislation, perhaps with an alternate title or with some kind of description that makes it clearly understood that this is, in fact, library legislation, not research library special interest legislation.

MR. LORENZ: I am very glad you spelled that out. All of this is written into the legislative report on Title II-C, that the purpose of this legislation was to extend the strength of research libraries in the national interest, but the title itself, "Strengthening Research Library Resources," does not really bring this connotation across. I do think we should keep that in mind in the extension of the legislation.

I will go then to the next item, which is copyright. Since the last meeting, there has not been much new developing on the copyright front. However, the six national library associations are continuing to monitor what is going on in the field so that they will be ready for any action that may be needed.

In response to a request which appeared in the Federal Register, the six associations are drafting language to be submitted to the Register of Copyrights, which would constitute a warning, based on the legislation,

which will need to appear on library photocopying equipment, and, possibly on the interlibrary loan forms as of January 1978. The wording we will recommend, I can assure you, will be just as brief as possible. Of course, what the six national library associations submit will be only one suggestion among many, and it is very difficult to predict what the final language will be. At least we have put our heads together on this and have agreed on a submission.

We have also asked the Register of Copyrights how she plans to monitor the results of the library photocopying provisions of the law, as she is required to do by the legislation over the next five years. She indicated that, at the present time, she is not able to be responsive to this request, but we did want to get on record that, as library associations, we were interested in cooperating with the Register in monitoring the effect of library photocopying on libraries, users of libraries, and publishers.

At a recent meeting of the Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works, the Association of American Publishers presented its plan for a clearinghouse for payments for photocopying that exceeds the limit imposed by the guidelines under Section 108 of the copyright legislation. They are planning a clearinghouse that, initially, would cover technical, scientific, and medical journal articles, and they hope to establish this payments clearinghouse by January 1978. They indicate that they have cooperation from about 700 publishers of technical, scientific, and medical journals, who will include a code number on the front page of every article that is to be copyrighted plus a cost figure for every copy that exceeds fair use under the provisions of Section 108. The implication is that journal articles which do not have a code number and price indication could be copied without any requirement to pay. I have been testing this concept with a few of you and have found that some of you would like to have an easy method of paying for copying. Any questions on this development under copyright legislation?

I might just say, incidentally, that the life of CONTU probably will be extended to July 1978, since the Commission was seven months late in being named and appointed. The six national library associations are planning to present a statement to CONTU sometime in September or October, when the results of some key studies, such as the King Research report should be available. We feel we should make sure that whatever CONTU considers in its final report will include the views of library associations.

We are also planning to develop further guidelines on library photocopying so that we can be more specific and responsive to questions that you may have in following the provisions of the copyright law. Hopefully, these will be available in September or October. We are keeping in touch with the American Council on Education, which is developing similar guidelines for the teaching use of copyrighted materials, and, to the greatest degree possible, we will coordinate these guideline statements. We realize that libraries are in the middle of the whole process involved in the teaching use of copyrighted materials. We are being very cautious in planning further guidelines, because lawyers have warned us that any time we are more

specific about the law than we need to be, we may be giving away some of the rights that libraries retain under fair use. Section 108 really sets minimal guidelines of what libraries can do in interloan copying, but libraries may have broader rights under fair use than they have under Section 108. So, we don't want to get out guidelines that are going to restrict you any more than we need to. We do think there is an advantage in the six national library associations joining together on guidelines which would go out to all of our constituents so that at least you would not be getting conflicting information.

MR. MCDONALD (Connecticut): I understood you to say September or October for those guidelines, and I wonder if that timetable could be shortened somewhat. I ask because some libraries are already preparing--or have prepared--their own guidelines. Some that I have seen are much too cautious and are doing precisely what you indicated could happen, that is they are giving away more than the law may really require us to. For that reason, I think it would be helpful to have guidance that would prevent us from being too much at variance with one another in what we are practicing in our libraries.

I would like to conclude this, John, by saying I thought it was an admirable report you have given, and I think a great deal of progress has been made.

MR. LORENZ: Of course, as everyone knows, the legislation doesn't go into effect until January 1978, but we also realize, as John has indicated, that you need as much advance information as you can get. We will certainly keep this very much in mind and try to strike the most reasonable balance.

MR. SCHMIDT (Albany): Is it your intention to share with us the materials that ACE produces on Section 107? I know that some people with whom I have discussed the matter find themselves being used as the campus experts on 107. I have managed so far to dodge that responsibility and to speak only to 108(g)(2).

MR. LORENZ: Absolutely. As part of our communications with members, we will send you anything and everything we think will be instructive and useful.

Since our last meeting there have also been new developments at the National Endowment on the Humanities, particularly in connection with the Challenge Grant program. I understand that the National Endowment is now assured of funds for fiscal 1977, in which we are now operating, and that Challenge Grant funds for fiscal 1978 are also in the line. I am very glad that Margaret Child is here from the National Endowment for the Humanities to bring us up to date as to where this program stands.

MS. CHILD: Some of you are aware, I am sure, that there was a moment of panic when the fiscal 1977 supplemental appropriation was going through Congress a few months ago, because efforts were being made to provide the National Endowment for the Arts with its full authorization of $12 million while Endowment for the Humanities was cut back to $6.75 million. The argument for this was that the constituency for the arts endowment was much

larger than the constituency served by humanities. The humanities, of course, immediately issued an outraged cry. I am happy to say there were several research librarians joining in this chorus of protest, and, as a result, the legislation which was finally passed restored parity to both, giving both endowments $9 million for fiscal 1977. So, that is what we have to work with this fiscal year.

Meanwhile, we have received the first round of applications under the Challenge Grant program. They came in against an April 1 deadline, which many people in the Endowment felt was an appropriate date. We received almost 200 applications in that first round spanning all areas served by the Endowment. Administratively, we attempted to assign each application to the division most appropriate for processing, and, as a result, most of the library applications came to me in the Division of Research Grants. However, the Acting Chairman of the Endowment decided that an institution could receive only one grant out of the total funds for fiscal years 1977 and 1978. Because of this decision, many institutions submitted very multifaceted applications. This meant that the library component was often combined with other needs within the whole university application. In some instances, the major thrust of the application was for support for some teaching elements of the institution, so those applications went to our Division of Education rather than coming to Research. The result was that I actually processed only 18 applications. I was a little disappointed that there were not more "strictly library" applications, but actually I was not that disappointed. I was merely relieved.

The work of processing the first round was a bit daunting, because our guidelines, for those of you who have read them, were left very fluid so that we could remain as flexible as possible. This meant, of course, that we were faced with all kinds of problems that had to be decided or solved after the applications were received.

As far as the research library constituency is concerned, the one decision which affects you directly stemmed from a recommendation made by the consultant we brought in to help us look at this first round of applications. That decision suggests that, although the initial guidelines say these grants can be used to support acquisitions, we now think this category is really too broad. It was felt that, given the research library constituency which the Endowment has been serving, and given general trends occurring in that community throughout the country, the Endowment did not want to support current acquisitions budgets just to compensate for inflationary pressures. We felt that support of this kind would work against resource sharing, and it would work against all kinds of network arrangements that we have been supporting for the last several years. As a result, we have decided to make Challenge Grants available for acquisitions only where those acquisitions are building upon the demonstrated strength of the library concerned, primarily in special collections. Cornell, for instance, could conceivably come to us for support for its Icelandic collection, which is a preeminent one in this country. Hypothetically, at least, we might be willing to support their efforts to go on developing this primary strong Icelandic collection. I hope I am not insulting someone else who feels

that their's is the preeminent Icelandic collection in this country. In any case, our support will be narrowed in this way.

Other than that, the applications ranged widely. We have requests for support for construction, support for endowment, support for various special library purposes, and support for renovation. Actually, I think we saw more renovation requests than anything else, particularly for the installation of climate control devices which would increase the life of materials being housed.

So, that is about the point at which we are now. There is another deadline June 1 and still another one September 1. The authorization for fiscal 1978 is $18 million. Since these are multi-year applications, we will be sending out awards on this first round based on the proposition that a good part of that $18 million authorization will actually be appropriated next year. To an extent, we are going to be mortgaging those funds, and we are, of course, sending out letters which will spend every last penny of the nine million we have for this year. We hope, by so doing, that we will perhaps convince Congress that we do indeed have a constituency out there and that the money can be well spent.

MR. LORENZ: Can you tell us how many of the applications for 1977 are likely to be approved?

MS. CHILD: The answer is 13.

MR. LORENZ: Any other questions to Margaret relating to the Challenge Grant program?

MR. MCDONALD: Is there anything in print which describes some of the successful applications?

MS. CHILD: Actually, the successful applications are not yet successful. Council meets at the end of next week, and they would not like me to be giving the impression that they are rubber stamp. But there will be an announcement. Our public information office is planning to make a massive announcement describing all the grants which have been made during this first round.

MR. MCDONALD: There is nothing like seeing what success is. The guidelines are eloquent.

MS. CHILD: Often what we do--and I don't see the Challenge Grant as any exception--is to give prospective applicants successful applications to look at as models. There were a couple this time that were real models.

MR. LORENZ: I understand, as of yesterday, President Carter signed the supplemental Appropriation Act. This includes fiscal 1977 funding for such Higher Education Act provisions as Titles II-A and II-B and also includes a few items for the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services. The three and a half million for that White House Conference process is, in effect, now in hand. As you know, these funds will be administered

by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, with Fred Burkhardt as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on the White House Conference process and Alphonse Trezza as Executive Director. Al, would you like to indicate to us how research libraries might participate in this conference process, which I understand will begin with a series of state conferences? Keep in mind that the membership of ARL includes the New York Public Library, the Boston Public Library, and the New York State Library.

MR. TREZZA: I am well aware, but I may wish that ARL would remember it too.

MR. LORENZ: How could we forget it?

MR. TREZZA: The White House Conference is finally a reality. It has taken a long time, and it has taken a lot of effort. There will be 50 state, and territorial conferences, and a special pre-conference for Indians on reservations held prior to the national conference, which has been set for the last week in September, 1979, in Washington. The success of the national conference depends on the state conferences.

The agency with which the Commission will deal in each state and territory is the state library agency. The state library agency is required to work with all groups within its state, but the states vary quite a bit. Some states have one state association for public and academic libraries, another for trustees, another for schools, another for AV people, and rather than the Commission trying to determine which groups are which in which state, we placed the responsibility on the state agency. The state agency must assure that all groups, including the private sector, are included. As individual librarians in your state, you can make certain that the state advisory committee, which is going to set up the state conference, includes your own constituency as you see it. In other words, make sure the research libraries' interests are represented on that committee.

Now, the one mandate they must remember at the state level is that the delegates to the state conference must be made up of two-thirds non-librarians and non-library trustees. That two-thirds should adhere at the local, county, and state levels, and should include people in industry, manufacturing, the professions and so forth. The argument for this ratio is that we meet all the time and can talk with each other on library terms. But this conference is aimed at the citizen, at the decisionmakers, and it is from that constituency that the national delegation will be selected. The national delegation will also have the same librarian to non-librarian ratio.

The national conference, as Senator Pell has said on many occasions, is to devise new omnibus library legislation for 1970 and 1981. It is essential for you to remember that we are going to move away from LSCA, HEA, and ESEA to new, comprehensive library bills. You will have the opportunity, first at the state level and then at the national level, to have your input and make sure this effort represents, to the best of your ability, what you want it to represent.

We at the Commission will do our best to make sure you are doing what you are supposed to do. If you have difficulty in your state, drop me a note, and I assure you I will personnaly see that the state is responsive to your agitation.

MR. LORENZ: I do think this White House Conference process is an opportunity to focus national attention on the problems and prospects of all types of libraries, including research libraries. It will get considerable visibility both at the state and national levels when the White House Conference is held in September. I believe that concludes my report, Mr. Chairman.

* * *

Report of the Office of Management Studies

The Office of University Library Management Studies operates a number of major developmental projects, in addition to providing information and training services for the membership. I will briefly highlight our activities in these areas and invite your inquiries. Both Jeff Gardner and I are available during this meeting--or at your convenience--to expound upon these brief comments. Also, the OMS Annual Report, which was distributed to members in February, provides detailed descriptions of both these activities and the important management issues the office is confronting.

The ongoing services to the membership include the OMS publications program, the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC), the training programs, and the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP). We have two new people on the office staff to help us provide these services. Maxine Sitts is the new replacement for our SPEC Coordinator. She was most recently the Publications Director for the ERIC Clearinghouse at Stanford University and is an experienced journalist. Her central responsibilities are, first to operate SPEC, which means conducting surveys, and producing SPEC Flyers and Kits. Second, she will help the OMS expand and improve its publications, which involves editing, designing, and producing. Recently, we have issued SPEC Flyers on allocation and budgeting techniques in research libraries. Our plans in this area include SPEC surveys and reports on security systems, media technology, automated circulation systems, procedures for the physical handling of books, preservation, and an update of the Flyers on collection development and acquisitions policy. I might emphasize again that the SPEC series does not provide answers or models, but is aimed instead at determining who is doing what. We do this so that librarians might take advantage of the experiences of their colleagues and avoid reinventing the wheel every time they are forced to address a problem.

The second new member of the OMS staff is Deanna Marcum. She will coordinate the training programs presently operated by the Office and will help us design an expanded training resources and services program. Some of our ongoing activities here include a training film program, regional workshops, and individual consultation to libraries interested in developing staff training and development programs. Our most recent effort was a Management Skills Institute held in Kansas City, Missouri, during April.

Twenty-nine people attended, and the participants gave the utility of the event uniformly high ratings. For this institute, we prepared a notebook for participants containing handouts, a conceptual outline, reprints, bibliographies, and other learning instruments. The notebook was intended to add structure to the ideas and issues covered in the institute, and we hope it will continue to be useful to the participants after they leave the institute. The notebook is available for review, if any of you are interested in seeing what goes into one of these institutes. Deanna is presently making arrangements for another institute, scheduled for November in the Washington, D.C. area.

Another ongoing commitment is the Management Review and Analysis Program. Our schedule calls for an application of MRAP at the University of Oklahoma this Fall.

I might now quickly review some of the developmental projects that we are working on. First is the Collection Analysis Project (CAP), which is aimed at designing and testing a generalized self-study procedure that individual libraries can use in examining their collection activities. We are also involved in efforts by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems to develop a library statistical data base that can be used for resource allocation and internal management decisions. An interim report on this project is available. A third major commitment is the Academic Library Development Program (ALDP), which aims to develop a self-study procedure for small and mid-sized academic libraries. A test of the procedure has been completed at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and a test of the revised manual is starting this month at the Carnegie-Mellon University. More information on this project is available from Dr. Grady Morein or the Council on Library Resources.

Our immediate priorities include: (1) the provision of services such as SPEC, MRAP, and Training Assistance to our members, and (2) an investment in selected developmental efforts such as CAP, Management Information Systems, and ALDP. There are a number of issues that we want to begin moving on, such as executive development, performance measures, and the analyses of user behavior. This is an ambitious agenda. Having a new person at SPEC and a new training coordinator will help. In addition, we have a new advisory committee to help and, of course, the CLR and John Lorenz.

MR. LATHEM: Any questions for Mr. Webster?

MR. DOUGHERTY: On your collection analysis project, I wanted to point out that the systemwide office of the University of California is about to embark on a top priority nine-campus project on rationalizing and developing an empirically-tested--I don't know what this means exactly--book fund formula. This will be developed along academic lines, and the Berkeley-Stanford project includes an extensive effort by both campuses to develop complementary collection policies that will allow us to actually compare the two. Right now, that means getting about 60 collections at Berkeley, and I don't know how many in Stanford, translated into that great LC system with all of its problems. I would hope that there could be some tie between your project

and what is happening in California. I think it would be too bad if your project went its way and this massive effort went its way and we did not bring them together. I think we each have something to learn from the other.

MR. WEBSTER: I appreciate your comment. We have also been in touch with the collection development officers of large research libraries. We have talked to Norman Dudley from UCLA concerning the shelflist measurement project for which he needs some support, and, earlier this week, I spent some time out at the San Diego campus talking about developments within California. I appreciate being tuned in.

* * * *

Closing Remarks

MR. LATHEM: There has been reference in the Executive Director's report to the ongoing concern of this Association in the area of copyright. I think all of you will be aware that, identically with the fall meeting of this Association, the copyright revision law was signed by the President. This Association, over the years, has devoted a great, great deal of effort and a great deal of money, indeed, to a concern for this legislation, first primarily on the part of Steve Riley in his incumbency as Executive Director, and most recently during John Lorenz's period of incumbency. But there was an interim when John McDonald, our Executive Director, devoted untold hours to consultation with legal counsel and to helping with the coordination of the library community's interests in this legislation and, indeed, to the giving of formal testimony in connection with the legislation.

The Executive Committee of the Association, I am sure, is more aware of the internal activities of the staff than could be any others, and this Executive Committee is very mindful of the devotion to this cause that John McDonald gave. John, if you would come forward, I would like to make a presentation to you on behalf of Virginia Whitney, Ray Frantz, and me, which is in the form of a gift-wrapped copy of Public Law 94-535. I want you to know that we have turned down the pages containing 108(g)(2).

MR. MCDONALD: Thank you. I am surprised but delighted. Forgive me, but I must say I feel like an academy award winner. I had no idea this was going to happen to me, but I want to say, as any award winner would, that, without your help, those great letters you wrote, it could not have happened. Thank you.

MR. REDMOND (Queen's Univ., Canada): A Canadian white paper on copyright was issued last month, which members of ARL may find extremely interesting. It is around 200 pages, and it sets forth probable government policy for the revision of the Canadian Copyright Act. Since this delves very much into the philosophy of copyright and is most disquieting to Canadian librarians, you may want to get your hands on it. It should be available from the Bureau of Intellectual Property of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in Ottawa.

APPENDIX - A

BYLAWS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
As Amended May 6, 1977

ARTICLE I - Offices.

The principal office of the Association shall be located in the office of the Executive Director. The Association may have such other offices as the Board of Directors may determine, or as the affairs of the Association may require from time to time.

ARTICLE II--Membership

Section 1--Member Institutions:

Membership in the Association shall be on an institutional basis. On invitation of the Association membership shall be open to major university libraries whose collections and services are broadly based and to certain other libraries whose collections are recognized as having national significance. Major university libraries are considered to be those whose parent institutions broadly emphasize research and graduate instruction at the doctoral level and grant their own degrees, which support large, comprehensive research collections on a permanent basis, and which give evidence of an institutional capacity for and commitment to the advancement and transmittal of knowledge.

Invitations to other libraries shall be issued at the initiative of the Board of Directors after approval of the membership.

Section 2--Qualifications for Membership:

Qualifications for membership are established by vote of the members and are reviewed from time to time. The Regulations in effect at any given time are available on request from the office of the Association.

Section 3--Termination of Membership:

Regulations for the termination of membership are established by vote of the members and are reviewed from time to time. The regulations in effect at any given time are available on request from the office of the Association.

Section 4--Transfer of Membership:

Membership in the Association is not transferable or assignable.

ARTICLE III - Board of Directors.

Section 1 - Board of Directors:

There shall be a Board of Directors which shall manage the affairs of the Association. The number of Directors shall be not less than nine nor more than twelve. The President, Vice-President, and Immediate Past President of the Association shall be members of the Board. Directors shall be elected for terms of three years, three to be elected annually as provided in Article IV. Each Director shall be chosen from among the chief librarians representing member institutions of the Association. Each Director shall take office at the close of the Annual Meeting at which he is elected and shall serve until the end of the Annual Meeting held at the close of his term of office. Notwithstanding any other provision contained in these Bylaws, an officer of the Association who is serving as a member of the Board of Directors may continue to serve as a member of the Board until the expiration of his term as officer despite the fact that his normal, three-year term as Director may have expired. Any vacancy arising in the Board of Directors shall be filled by the Board of Directors, the appointee to serve until the next Annual Meeting, when a successor for the unexpired term shall be nominated and elected by the members of the Association.

Section 2 - Quorum and Action:

A majority of the members of the Board of Directors shall constitute a quorum. Action by the Board of Directors shall be by majority vote of the Directors present except that, as provided in Article V, Section 4 of these Bylaws, election of the Vice-President shall be by the vote of an absolute majority of the total membership of the Board.

Section 3 - Notice of Meetings:

A regular meeting of the Board of Directors shall be held without other notice than this Bylaw, after the Annual Meeting of the Association, either on the same day thereof, or on the next succeeding day thereafter, at the time and place announced by the President at the Annual Meeting. The Board of Directors may provide by resolution the time and place for the holding of additional regular meetings of the Board of Directors without other notice than such resolution. Special meetings of the Board of Directors may be called by or at the request of the President or any two Directors. Notice of any special meeting of the Board of Directors shall be given at least ten days previously thereto by written notice delivered personally or sent by mail or telegram to each

Director at his address as shown by the records of the Association. If mailed, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when deposited in the United States mail in a sealed envelope so addressed, with postage thereon prepaid. If notice be given by telegram, such notice shall be deemed to be delivered when the telegram is delivered to the telegraph company. Notice of a meeting need not be given to any Director who signs a waiver of notice whether before or after the meeting, or who attends the meeting without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice to him. The business to be transacted at, and the purpose of, any special meeting of the Board of Directors shall be specified in the notice or waiver of notice of such meeting.

ARTICLE IV - Nomination and Elections of the Board of Directors.

Section 1 - Nominating Committee:

There shall be a nominating committee of three persons, one to be the Vice-President who shall serve as chairman of the Nominating Committee, and two persons to be appointed annually by the President of the Association.

Section 2 - Nomination:

It shall be the duty of the Nominating Committee to select annually as many nominees for the Board of Directors as there are vacancies on the Board to fill. No Director, having served a full three-year term, may be nominated to succeed himself. The consent of the candidates to serve, if elected, must be obtained before nominations are accepted. The report of the Nominating Committee shall be distributed to the members at least thirty days before the election.

Additional nominations may be made from the floor.

Section 3 - Elections of the Board:

Each member may vote for not more than three nominees, except for the election of a successor for an unexpired term.

The three candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall become members of the Board for three-year terms.

ARTICLE V - Officers.

Section 1 - Officers:

The officers of the Association shall be a President, a Vice-President, an Immediate Past President, and an Executive Director. The officers, except the Executive Director, shall serve for terms of one year each. The Vice-President shall automatically succeed to the Presidency at the end of his term as Vice-President. The President shall preside at meetings of the Association and of the Board of Directors. The President shall perform all duties incident to his office and such other duties as may be prescribed by the Board of Directors. In the absence of the President or in event of his inability or refusal to act, the Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President and, when so acting, shall have all the powers of and be subject to all the restrictions upon the President. The Vice-President shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the President or by the Board of Directors. The officers shall have and may exercise all the powers of the Board of Directors between meetings of the Board, when necessary. Their action shall be subject to subsequent ratification by the Board of Directors.

Section 2- Executive Director:

There shall be an Executive Director of the Association, appointed by the Board of Directors, who shall serve at its pleasure. The Executive Director shall serve as Director of the Association but shall not be a member of the Board of Directors. He shall also serve as Treasurer of the Association and shall be bonded.

Section 3 - Duties of the Executive Director:

The Executive Director shall be in charge of the principal office of the Association and its personnel; he shall conduct the Association's administrative affairs; he shall be responsible for the execution of all orders of the Board of Directors; he shall prepare an annual budget and carry out the activities provided for in the budget as adopted by the Board of Directors; he shall have charge and custody of and be responsible for all funds and securities of the Association; he shall receive and give receipts for moneys due and payable to the Association from any source whatsoever and deposit all such moneys in the name of the Association in such depositories as shall be selected by the Board of Directors; he shall see that all notices are duly given in accordance with these Bylaws or as required by law; he shall

keep a register of the post office address of each member which shall be furnished to the Executive Director by such member; he shall keep all minutes, and issue minutes and reports as required by the Board of Directors; he shall perform such other duties as from time to time may be assigned to him by the Board of Directors.

Section 4 - Vice-President:

The Vice-President shall be chosen from among members of the Board of Directors. Notwithstanding Article II, Section 2 of these Bylaws, he shall be elected by the vote of an absolute majority of the total membership of the Board. In the event that no one candidate for Vice-President receives an absolute majority in the first election, there shall be a run-off election between the two candidates receiving the highest number of votes, and that candidate receiving a majority in the run-off election shall be elected Vice-President. In the event the run-off election results in a tie, additional elections shall be conducted until one candidate receives a majority.

ARTICLE VI - Meetings.

Section 1 - Annual and Special Meetings:

There shall be an Annual Meeting of the Association at a time and place to be determined by the Board of Directors. The Association may meet at such other times and places as may be determined by the Board of Directors.

Section 2 - Notice of Meetings:

Written or printed notice stating the place, day and hour of any meeting of the Association shall be delivered, either personally or by mail, to each member entitled to vote at such meeting, not less than ten nor more than fifty days before the date of such meeting, except as otherwise required by law or by these Bylaws, by or at the direction of the Board of Directors, the President or the Executive Director. When a meeting is adjourned to another time or place, it shall not be necessary to give any notice of the adjourned meeting if the time and place to which the meeting is adjourned are announced at the meeting at which the adjournment is taken, and at the adjourned meeting any business which might have been transacted on the original date of the meeting may be transacted. In case of a special meeting or when required by law or by these Bylaws, the purpose or purposes for which the meeting is called shall be stated in the notice. If mailed, the

notice of a meeting shall be deemed delivered when deposited in the United States mail addressed to the member at its address as it appears on the register of members, with postage thereon prepaid.

Section 3 - Quorum and Action

A majority of the total membership shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and an affirmative vote of a majority of the members voting, but not less than one-third of the total membership, shall be sufficient except as otherwise required by law or by these Bylaws.

Section 4 - Voting

Each member shall be entitled to one vote on each matter submitted to a vote of the members. A member shall be represented in proxy by its chief librarian, or, in his absence, by its associate or one of its assistant librarians. Voting may be by proxy or by mail or by a combination thereof.

Section 5 - Parliamentary Procedures:

The conduct of meetings shall follow Robert's Rules of Order.

ARTICLE VII - Committees.

In addition to the Nominating Committee, such other standing and ad hoc committees as may be needed to carry out the business of the Association may be appointed by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VIII - Dues.

Section 1 - Fixing of Dues:

Membership dues shall be proposed by the Board of Directors and shall require approval by an affirmative vote of a majority of the total membership of the Association after due notice.

Section 2 - Forfeiture of Membership for Failure to Pay Dues:

A member failing to pay dues for two successive years shall automatically forfeit membership in the Association.

ARTICLE IX - Contracts, Checks, Deposits and Funds.

Section 1 - Contracts:

The Board of Directors may authorize any officer or officers, agent or agents of the Association, in addition to the officers so authorized by these Bylaws, to enter into any contract or execute and deliver any instrument in the name of and on behalf of the Association, and such authority may be general or confined to specific instances.

Section 2 - Checks, Drafts, etc:

All checks, drafts or orders for the payment of money, notes or other evidences of indebtedness issued in the name of the Association, shall be signed by such officer or officers, agent or agents of the Association and in such manner as shall from time to time be determined by resolution of the Board of Directors. In the absence of such determination by the Board of Directors, such instruments shall be signed by the Executive Director and counter-signed by the President or Vice-President.

Section 3 - Deposits:

All funds of the Association shall be deposited from time to time to the credit of the Association in such depositories as the Board of Directors may select.

Section 4 - Gifts:

The Board of Directors may accept on behalf of the Association any grant, contribution, gift, bequest or device for the general purposes or for any special purpose of the Association.

ARTICLE X - Books and Records.

The Association shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, Board of Directors and committees having any of the authority of the Board of Directors, and shall keep at the principal office a register giving the names and addresses of the members entitled to vote. All books and records of the Association may be inspected by any members, or his agent or attorney for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

ARTICLE XI - Fiscal Year.

The fiscal year of the Association shall be the calendar year.

ARTICLE XII - Waiver of Notice.

Notice of meeting need not be given to any member who signs a waiver of notice, whether before or after the meeting. The attendance of or voting by any member at a meeting, without protesting, prior thereto or at its commencement, the lack of notice of such meeting, shall constitute a waiver of notice by such member.

ARTICLE XIII - Amendments.

Amendment of these Bylaws requires an affirmative vote of a majority of the total membership of the Association, at any meeting of the Association, provided that notice of such meeting and the proposed amendment has been given in writing at least thirty days in advance of the meeting by the Executive Director with the approval of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE XIV - Dissolution.

Upon dissolution of the Association, the assets of the Association shall be applied and distributed as follows:

a. All liabilities and obligations of the Association shall be paid, satisfied, and discharged, or adequate provision shall be made therefor;

b. Assets held by the Association upon condition requiring return, transfer, or conveyance, which condition occurs by reason of the dissolution, shall be returned, transferred, or conveyed in accordance with such requirements;

c. Assets received and held by the Association subject to limitations permitting their use only for literary, educational, scientific, or similar purposes, but not held upon a condition requiring return, transfer, or conveyance by reason of the dissolution, shall be transferred or conveyed to one or more organizations exempt from income tax as organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code having as and pursuing purposes substantially similar to those of the Association, pursuant to a duly adopted plan of distribution;

d. Any remaining assets shall be distributed to one or more organizations exempt from income tax as organizations described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code for any one or more literary, educational, or scientific purpose or purposes, or to the federal government, or to a state or local government, for a public purpose, pursuant to a duly adopted plan of distribution, or by a court to one or more such organizations to be used in such manner as in the judgment of the court will best accomplish the purposes for which the Association was organized.

Adopted January 28-29, 1962
Amended June 22, 1968
January 17, 1971
May 12-13, 1972
May 6, 1977

APPENDIX - B

Association of Research Libraries Task Force on the Requirements of National Library Network Development; Background and Issues

The ARL Task Force on Networking was created to ensure that the Association can foster and maintain close liaison with groups currently active in the development of a national network. The Task Force was charged to identify issues of particular concern to ARL libraries, and to recommend to the Board appropriate Actions.

This paper reflects both the sense of three recent planning documents prepared respectively by Avram, Livingston and Epstein, and the judgments and views expressed by members of the Task Force at its first meeting.

Among librarians the issue of a "national network" elicits strong interest, but as one might expect in our pluralistic society, no one individual or group has yet been given, or is likely to be given, complete authority to create such a network. Consequently, the task confronting the profession is to seek mechanisms to coordinate and integrate the interests and needs of many diverse groups and agencies. Larry Livingston, in his paper, envisions the national network as a "confederation of library networks and systems of essentially equal components, each retaining a high degree of internal autonomy, and all looking toward the Library of Congress for a significant part of the total bibliographic information needed by libraries affiliated with each component." Livingston's prognosis of diversity seems to be consistent with past and current developmental patterns.

Organized developmental activities continue to proliferate. The Council of Computerized Library Networks campaigns actively for the accelerated growth of local, regional, and national networks. The Ohio College Library Center, usually viewed as one component in the emerging national network, recently appointed a committee to advise the OCLC Board on potential relationships between OCLC and other components of a national network. The Library of Congress has convened a planning committee composed of representatives from various regional networks and network utilities. This planning group is charged to advise the Library on its possible role in the national network. The group under its Chair, Henriette Avram is assessing current resources, considering strategies and methods for developing a national data base(s) reviewing possible computer configurations for the system's architecture, and identifying legal and organizational issues that must be addressed.

The organizations and institutions represented on this planning group are influential. This suggests that the group's recommendations will have a pivotal effect on future developmental efforts.

Interest in network development has already spawned several concept papers on network planning strategies. Papers by Hank Epstein, Director of BALLOTS at Stanford University and by Larry Livingston, Council on Library Resources are two examples. While the papers do reflect differences in approach and emphasis, they overlap in many respects and the ideas presented are complimentary.

The ARL task force met for the first time during the Association's fall 1976 meeting. The purpose was to identify the emerging issues related to network development. The remainder of this document enumerates and summarizes those issues identified by the Task Force.

Network Structure and Organization

The actual structure of the National Network will influence the roles played by ARL libraries. In one of the planning documents, it is proposed that existing library organizations be divided into three general levels:

1. Regional service centers (multi-state service centers and networks): e.g., NELINET, SOLINET, and AMIGOS bibliographic council, MIDLENET, BCR (Bibliographic Center for Research), Denver, CLASS (California Library Authority for Systems and Services), PNBC (Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center, etc.)

2. Bibliographic utilities: e.g., OCLC, Research Libraries Group, BALLOTS, Washington Library Network, etc.

3. Local libraries.

(Source: A National Network: Access to Data. A draft by Hank Epstein. BALLOTS Center)

ARL Libraries would function as local resource libraries in this organizational configuration. Many questions remain to be answered. For example, in what ways would ARL Libraries interact with other segments of the network? If ARL libraries receive a mandate to serve as regional resources, wouldn't this role necessitate a modification of existing institutional mission statements? At present, the prime constituencies of most ARL libraries are faculty and students of their parent institutions. Even though most ARL libraries assist users not affiliated with

the parent institution, these activities are of secondary importance. If ARL libraries assume broader service roles, what actions would be required to insure that library funds are not diverted to the detriment of services to prime constituencies, and that specialized collections of research libraries so essential to the support of network information services, are adequately funded? Title II C of the HEA, "strengthening research library resources" even though not yet funded for fiscal 1977 or 1978 may, with the right regulations and administration, be a source of funding for these purposes.

It seems clear that the profession will place a high priority on the development of local and regional union catalogs for improving access to regional resources. The Task Force supports this priority, since recent research studies have shown that as bibliographic access to local holdings improves, noticeable shifts in interlibrary loan lending and borrowing patterns occur, and as work load patterns are redistributed, reductions should be observed in the number of requests addressed to the large research libraries.

It is also clear that the manner in which ARL libraries interact with other libraries within designated resource areas will differ from state to state and region to region. The Task Force believes that new policies will be required to resolve organizational, inter-institutional, and inter-regional divergencies.

Standardization of Communication Protocols

Regional systems already utilize vastly different types of computer hardware products along with locally-developed software packages that are not generalizable to other systems. These factors will compound the problems associated with developing a unified network structure. They will not be easy to eliminate. To resolve these incompatibilities will require common communication protocols. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that the principle of common communication protocols be adopted as a requirement of any national network plan.

Closure of Card Catalogs

There seems to be great interest among ARL librarians in seeking alternatives to the traditional card catalog. If this interest is sufficiently widespread, the Task Force recommends that high priority be placed on programs to achieve a coordinated national effort to close card catalogs. ARL should also become actively involved in the design and development of economical substitutes to card catalogs. The most frequently cited media are microform catalogs, on-line query systems or some combination of both.

Data Base Quality Control

There are many questions about the bibliographical quality of data entered into regional or national data bases. In a nutshell, the Task Force is concerned about the need for authority control files. Based on the statements expressed in the Avram, Livingston, and Epstein papers, there seems to be a prevailing feeling among network planners that some form of the authority control is essential. The Task Force believes that the issues of authority control, and the methods for entering and validating bibliographical data entered into data bases are of sufficient importance to ARL libraries that the Association should seek assurances that any national system will incorporate acceptable quality control mechanisms.

The Cost of Network Services

Most network development activities will probably be funded from a combination of sources including state and federal governmental agencies, individual institutions, and private foundations. Although developmental costs will be underwritten by governmental agencies and foundations, ARL librarians should pay particular attention to costs associated with the utilization of network services once the networks become operational. There are many cost-related issues that must be addressed. The following represent only a selective sampling. What will be the cost of utilizing cataloging data; what will be the cost of accessing library holdings information; will libraries be able to afford systems that provide the capability to share acquisition purchase information; and will libraries be expected to absorb the cost of network services, or will these costs be passed on in part or in toto to library users? These, along with many other issues, will not be easily resolved. They will require the close, careful attention of ARL's membership.

Managerial Issues

The introduction of computer-based systems will create many new problems for the ARL library director. On-line systems that distribute bibliographic data will lead to significant changes in existing library staffing patterns. The availability of catalog data in machine readable form from the Ohio College Library Center has already enabled many libraries to realign the staffing complements of technical service units. While most reallocations can be accomplished through normal attrition, i.e. resignations, retirements, and transfers, more drastic personnel actions could become necessary. Larry Livingston has cautioned, "the personnel turbulence which will result from more effective library networks and their impact on the library will provide, perhaps, the greatest challenge to the network librarian that

he has ever faced. Obviously, he must plan ahead and prepare to train his staff and to reassure them that the network will not replace them entirely."

Summarized briefly, the emerging issues related to network development seem to include: organization and structure, standardization of bibliographic data and communication protocols, quality control of bibliographical data, potentially expensive operational costs, and new managerial problems. Because the nation's research libraries should plan a central role in any national network, the Task Force recommends to the Board that the Association takes those steps necessary to ensure its representation on key planning groups. It is equally important that the Association and its members remain informed about issues related to network development; therefore, the Task Force recommends that time for periodic progress reports be alloted at forthcoming Association meetings. One immediate step the Association might take is to identify procedures and policies that will ameliorate the undesirable impacts of introducing computer technologies into existing technical services operations.

Hugh C. Atkinson
Richard De Gennaro
Richard M. Dougherty, Chairman
John H. Gribbin
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
William Welsh

March 1977

APPENDIX - C

ATTENDANCE AT 90TH MEMBERSHIP MEETING
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
MAY 5-6, 1977

University of Alabama Libraries
Arthur P. Young

University of Alberta Library
Mohan Sharma

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Koepp

Boston Public Library
Liam Kelley

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University Library
Donald K. Nelson

University of British Columbia Library
Basil Stuart-Stubbs

Brown University Library
Charles Churchwell

University of California Library
(Berkeley) Richard M. Dougherty

University of California Library
(Davis) Bernard Kreissman

University of California Library
(San Diego) Millicent D. Abell

University of California Library
(Santa Barbara) Donald C. Davidson

Case Western Reserve University
James V. Jones

Center for Research Libraries
Gordon R. Williams

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Colorado Library
Leo W. Cabell

Colorado State University
Le Mayne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

University of Connecticut Library
John P. McDonald

Cornell University Libraries
Gormly Miller

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Duke University Libraries
Connie Dunlap

Emory University Library
Don L. Bosseau

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

Univeristy of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

University of Hawaii Library
Stanley L. West

University of Houston Library
Robert V. Haynes

Howard University Library
Binford H. Conley

University of Illinois Library
Hugh Atkinson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlop

Iowa State University Library
Warren B. Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
David Stam

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
James Ranz

University of Kentucky Library
Paul Willis

Library of Congress
William J. Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Thomas Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry, Jr.

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
William Ready

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Richard J. Talbot

Mass. Inst. of Technology Libraries
Jay Lucker

University of Michigan Library
Frederick H. Wagman

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Minnesota Library
Eldred Smith

University of Misourri Library
John H. Gribbin

National Agricultural Library
Richard A. Farley

National Library of Canada
Guy Sylvestre

National Library of Medicine
Melvin Day

University of Miami Library
Archie L. McNeal

University of Nebraska Libraries
Gerald A. Rudolph

New York Public Library
Richard W. Couper

New York State Library
E.J. Josey

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
Adele Combs

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David E. Sparks

Ohio State University Library
William Studer

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
William Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Glenora Edwards Rossell

Princeton University Library
Richard Boss

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Rice University
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Margaret Perry

Rutgers University Library
Virginia P. Whitney

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Russell Shank

University of South Carolina Library
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern California
(LA) Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Kenneth G. Peterson

Stanford University Libraries
Dale Canelas

State University of New York at Albany
James Smith

State University of New York - Stony Brook
John B. Smith

Syracuse University Library
Donald Anthony

Temple University Library
Joseph Nitecki

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

Texas A&M University Library
Irene B. Hoadley

University of Toronto Libraries
Maureen Hutchinson

Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Lib.
Thomas A. Souter

University of Virgina
Ray Frantz, Jr.

University of Washington, Seattle
Kenneth Allen

Washington State University Library
Allene F. Schnaitter

Washington University Libraries, St. Louis
Renata Rotkowicz

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Wisconsin Library
Joseph Treyz, Jr.

Yale University Libraries
Rutherford D. Rogers

Queen's University (Canada)
Donald A. Redmond

Guests

Stanton F. Biddle, Council on Library Resources Intern - Berkeley
Margaret Child, National Endowment for the Humanities
Mark Curtis, Consultant
John Haak, University of California, San Diego
Dick Hays, Office of Education/HEW
Keyes Metcalf
James P. Riley, Federal Library Committee - LC
Virginia Sherwood, University of California, San Diego
James E. Skipper, Research Libraries Group
Richard H. Sullivan, Carnegie Corporation of NY
Alphonse F. Trezza, National Comm. on Libraries & Info. Science

ARL Staff:

John G. Lorenz, Executive Director
Suzanne O. Frnakie, Associate Executive Director
James L. Beattie, ARL Research Specialist
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of Univ. Lib. Management Studies
Jeffrey J. Gardner, Management Research Specialist
Deanna Marcum, Training Program Coordinator

ATTENDANCE BY THE MEMBERSHIP - NAME INDEX

Abell, Millicent D.	University of California Library, San Diego
Ackerman, Page	University of California Library, Los Angeles
Allen, Kenneth•	University of Washington Library, Seattle
Anderson, Le Moyne W.	Colorado State University Library
Anthony, Donald	Syracuse University Library
Atkinson, Hugh	University of Illinois Library
Axford, William	University of Oregon Library
Boes, Warren N.	University of Georgia Libraries
Boss, Richard	Princeton University Library
Bosseau, Don L.	Emory University Libraries
Bryant, Douglas W.	Harvard University Library
Budington, William	John Crerar Library
Cabell, Leo W.	University of Colorado Library
Canelas, Dale	Stanford University Libraries
Chapin, Richard	Michigan State University Library
Churchwell, Charles	Brown University Library
Conley, Binford H.	Howard University Library
Combs, Adele	Northwestern University Libraries
Couper, Richard W.	New York Public Library
Dagnese, Joseph M.	Purdue University Library
Davidson, Donald C.	University of California Library, Santa Barbara
Day, Melvin	National Library of Medicine
Dougherty, Richard M.	University of California Library, Berkeley
Dunlap, Leslie W.	University of Iowa Libraries
Farley, Richard A.	National Agricultural Library
Forth, Stuart	Pennsylvania State University Library
Frantz, Ray Jr.	University of Virginia
Gennaro, Richard De	University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Gillies, Thomas	Linda Hall Library
Govan, James F.	University of North Carolina Libraries
Gribbin, John H.	University of Missouri Library
Grisham, Frank P.	Joint University Libraries
Guidry, George Jr.	Louisiana State University Library
Haas, Warren J.	Columbia University Libraries
Harrer, Gustave	University of Florida Libraries
Haynes, Robert V.	University of Houston Library
Hoadley, Irene B.	Texas A&M University Library
Hunt, Donald R.	University of Tennessee Libraries
Hutchinson, Maureen	University of Toronto Libraries

Jeffs, Joseph E.	Georgetown University Library
Jones, James V.	Case Western Reserve Library
Josey, E.J.	New York State Library
Kelley, Liam	Boston Public Library
Kidman, Roy L.	University of Southern California Library, LA
Koepp, Donald	Arizona State University Library
Kreissman, Bernard	University of California Library, Davis
Kuhn, Warren B.	Iowa State University Library
Laird, W. David	University of Arizona Library
Lathem, Edward C.	Dartmouth College Libraries
Laucus, John	Boston University Library
Lucker, Jay	Mass. Inst. of Technology Libraries
McDonald, John P.	University of Connecticut Library
McElderry, Stanley	University of Chicago Library
McNeal, Archie L.	University of Miami Library
Miller, Charles	Florida State University Library
Miller, Gormly	Cornell University Libraries
Nelson, Donald K.	Brigham Young Univeristy
Nitecki, Joseph	Temple University Library
O'Keeffe	Rice University
Perry, Margaret	University of Rochester Libraries
Peterson, Kenneth G.	Southern Illinois University Library
Pings, Vern M.	Wayne State University Libraries
Ranz, James	University of Kansas Library
Ready, William	McMaster University Library
Redmond, Donald A.	Queen's University (Canada)
Rogers, Rutherford D.	Yale University Libraries
Rossell, Glenora Edwards	University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Rotkowicz, Renata	Washington University Libraries, St. Louis
Rouse, Roscoe	Oklahoma State University Library
Rudolph, Gerald A.	University of Nebraska Libraries
Schmidt, James	State University of New York at Albany
Schnaitter, Allene F.	Washington State University Library
Scott, Marianne	McGill University Library
Shank, Russell	Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Sharma, Mohan	Univeristy of Alberta Library
Smith, Eldred	University of Minnesota Libraries
Smith, John B.	State University of New York at Stony Brook
Souter, Thomas A.	Virginia Polytechnic Inst. & State Library
Sparks, David E.	University of Notre Dame Libraries
Stam, David	Johns Hopkins University Library
Stuart-Stubbs, Basil	University of British Columbia Library
Studer, William	Ohio State University Library
Sylvestre, Guy	National Library of Canada

Talbot, Richard J.	University of Massachusetts Libraries
Toombs, Kenneth E.	University of South Carolina Library
Treyz, Joseph Jr.	University of Wisconsin Library
Wagman, Frederick H.	University of Michigan Library
Welsh, William J.	Library of Congress
West, Stanley L.	University of Hawaii Library
Whitney, Virginia P.	Rutgers University Library
Williams, Gordon R.	Center for Research Libraries
Willis, Paul	University of Kentucky
Young, Arthur P.	University of Alabama Libraries
Zink, James K.	University of Oklahoma Library

APPENDIX- D

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

May, 1977

ARL OFFICERS AND BOARD FOR 1976-77

Edward C. Lathem, President
Ray Frantz, Jr., Vice President & President-elect
Virginia P. Whitney, Past President
Le Moyne Anderson (Oct. 1979)
Richard Boss (Oct. 1977)
Connie R. Dunlap (Oct. 1979)
Richard A. Farley (Oct. 1978)
Rutherford D. Rogers (Oct. 1979)
Russell Shank (Oct. 1977)
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. (Oct. 1978)

Ad Hoc Committee on ARL Program Priorities

Connie Dunlap
Richard Farley
Russell Shank
Ray Frantz, ex-officio

ARL STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Cagle, Lily Library (1979)
John Finzi, LC (1979)
Leslie Dunlap, Chairman (1979)
C. Herbert Finch, Cornell (1979)

Committee on Center for Chinese Research Materials

Roy Hofheinz, Jr.
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Weiying Wan
Eugene Wu
Philip McNiff, Chairman

Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Gustave Harrer
Bruce Peel
Gordon Williams
Joseph Jeffs, Chairman (1978)

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

H. Gordon Bechanan (1978)
Richard Boss (1978)
Richard E. Chapin (1977)
Ruth Kirk (1977)
David Weber (1978)
Jay Lucker, Chairman (1978)

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

Philip McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

ARL/CRL Joint Committee for a National Periodicals Lending Library

Douglas W. Bryant, Chairman
Richard De Gennaro, Vice Chairman
Warren Haas
Arthur Hamlin
John G. Lorezn
John McDonald
William Welsh
Robert Wessel
Virginia P. Whitney
Gordon Williams

Committee on Nominations

Ray Frantz, Jr., Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Library Materials

James F. Govan
Joanne Harrar
David Stam, Chairman

ARL/ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards

Calvin Boyer
William Kurth
John P. McDonald
Stanley McElderry
Richard Talbot
David Watkins
Eldred Smith, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on ARL Membership (1978)

Don Bosseau
John McDonald
Stanley McElderry
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

Task Force on ARL Statistics (1979)

Donald Koepp
Kendon Stubbs
Richard Talbot, Chairman

Task Force on National Library Network Development

Hugh Atkinson (1978)
Richard De Gennaro (1978)
John Gribbin (1978)
Basil Stuart-Stubbs (1978)
William Welsh (1978)
Richard Dougherty, Chairman (1978)

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution on War, Peace and Revolution
J.M.C. Crossey, Yale University
Esther J. Walls, SUNY Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiych, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Joseph A. Placek, University of Michigan
Paul Horecky, Library of Congress

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Richard De Gennaro, University of Pennsylvania
Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California - Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
William H. Kurth, Washington University - St. Louis
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

REPRESENTATIVES

ANSI Committee Z-39..... John Lorenz
CONSER Project..... Ryburn Ross
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials..... William Budington
Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee (ALA)..... Donald Koepp
Universal Serials & Book Exchange..... Joanne Harrar
Special Libraries Association..... Joseph M. Dagnese

APPENDIX - E

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

MAY 1977

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Donald K. Nelson, Director
(801) 374-1211 Ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T IW5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Page Ackerman, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Millicent Abell, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Donald Davidson, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon M. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinatti, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Library Admin. &
Director of Libraries
(513) 475-2533

Univeristy of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Leo Cabell, Acting Director
(303) 492-6144

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Warren J. Hass, Vice President & Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
John P. McDonald, Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
J. Gormly Miller, Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Connie R. Dunlap, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(404) 329-6861

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D.C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 542-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2401

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Stanley L. West, University Librarian
(808) 958-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Robert V. Haynes, Interim Director
of Libraries
(713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D.C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library Admin
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services
(515) 294 1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
David Stam, Librarian
(301) 338-8325

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries (216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry, Jr., Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill Univeristy Library
Montreal, P.Q., Canada H3C 3G1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4L6
William Ready, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4781

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Eldred Smith, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
John Gribbin, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ont., Canada K1A ON4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
Peter Paulson, Director of the State
Library (518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Carlton C. Rochell, Dean of Libraries
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
William Studer, Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James K. Zink, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 624-6321

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford, University Libn.
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Richard Boss, Librarian
(609) 452-3170

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main - Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Margaret Perry, Acting Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P. Whitney, Librarian
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at Tenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Librari
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(213) 746-2543

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth C. Peterson, Dean of Libr. Affiars
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Standford, California 94305
David G. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
C. James Schmidt, Director
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo
Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Saktidas Roy, Acting Director
(716) 831-4216

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook, New York 11790
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Library
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(512) 471-3811

Texas A & M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ont., Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 978-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
Dorothy G.L. Whittemore, Acting Libn.
(504) 865-5131

University of Miami Library
P.O. box 248214
Coral Gables, Florida 33124
Archie L. McNeal, Director
(305) 284-3551

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Like City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of
Libraries
(703) 951-5593

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 924-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99163
Dr. Allene F. Schnaitter, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
Ms. Renata Rotkowicz, Act. Univ. Libn.
(314) 863-0100 Ext. 4523

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

University of Western Ontario
London 72, Canada
Dr. Robert Lee, Director of Libraries
(519) 629-3165

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Donald A. Redmond, Chief Librarian
(613) 547-5950

APPENDIX - F

AUDITOR'S REPORT

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(with supplemental material)

TWO YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1976

Seidman & Seidman
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Seidman & Seidman
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
1200–18th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036 (202) 293-1570

January 25, 1977

Board of Directors
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D. C.

We have examined the statement of assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1976 and 1975, and the related statements of receipts and disbursements and changes in fund balances for the years then ended. Our examinations were made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. We did not examine the financial statements of the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project which reflect total assets and revenues of 8% and 15% respectively for 1976 and 9% and 15% for 1975. These statements were examined by other auditors whose reports have been furnished to us. Our opinion, insofar as it relates to the amounts included for this project, is based solely upon the reports of the other auditors.

As described in the note "Summary of Accounting Policies", the Association's policy is to prepare its financial statements on the basis of cash receipts and disbursements; consequently certain revenue and the related assets are recognized when received rather than when earned, and certain expenses are recognized when paid rather than when the obligation is incurred. Accordingly, the accompanying financial statements are not intended to present financial position and results of operations in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles.

Offices Throughout the United States • Representation in Other Parts of the World through Binder Seidman International

In our opinion, based upon our examination and the reports of the other auditors, the accompanying statements present fairly the assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries at December 31, 1976 and 1975, arising from cash transactions, and the recorded cash receipts and disbursements and changes in fund balances during the years then ended, on the basis of accounting described in the note "Summary of Accounting Policies" which basis has been applied in a consistent manner.

Seidman & Seidman

Certified Public Accountants

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

	December 31, 1976	December 31, 1975
ASSETS		
Cash in bank and on hand	$ 21 208	$ 3 400
Cash in savings accounts	48 491	29 813
Cash held by others - agency fund	53 323	50 711
Savings certificates	526 564	455 504
Deposits	1 174	292
	$650 760	$539 720
LIABILITIES		
Payroll taxes withheld	$ 2 226	$ 74
Special programs for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	109 072	64 112
Total liabilities	111 298	64 186
FUND BALANCES		
General Operating Fund	140 016	137 761
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	53 323	50 711
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	346 123	287 062
Total fund balances	539 462	475 534
	$650 760	$539 720

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1976	1975
RECEIPTS:		
Dues	$200 000	$206 000
Interest	14 142	16 678
Publications	9 684	9 762
Royalties	255	42
Miscellaneous	2 336	351
Total receipts	226 417	232 833
DISBURSEMENTS	252 362	231 318
Less administrative expenses charged to special programs	28 200	25 475
Net disbursements	224 162	205 843
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	$ 2 255	$ 26 990

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1976	1975
RECEIPTS:		
Dues	$ 74 572	$ 71 374
Sales to members and non-members	57 965	62 104
Interest	2 372	3 002
Totals	134 909	136 480
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Newspapers and microfilm	46 551	56 256
Purchases for members and non-members	40 626	53 710
Salaries	36 206	40 134
Payroll taxes	2 376	3 388
Storage	1 760	1 760
Royalties	1 542	4 249
Supplies	1 502	1 724
Insurance	856	700
Professional fees	775	700
Miscellaneous	103	36
Totals	132 297	162 657
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	$ 2 612	$(26 177)

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1976	1975
RECEIPTS:		
Sale of publications	$116 430	$192 068
Interest income	23 446	20 675
	139 876	212 743
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Cost of publications	51 842	111 193
Postage and other expenses	5 074	2 585
Transfer to Center for Chinese Research Materials program	23 899	28 934
	80 815	142 712
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	$ 59 061	$ 70 0

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES

	Year ended December 31, 1976	1975
GENERAL OPERATING FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$137 761	$110 771
ADD - excess of receipts over disbursements	2 255	26 990
BALANCE, at end of year	$140 016	$137 761
FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$ 50 711	$ 76 888
ADD - excess of receipts over (under) disbursements	2 612	(26 177)
BALANCE, at end of year	$ 53 323	$ 50 711
CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$287 062	$217 031
ADD - excess of receipts over disbursements	59 061	70 031
BALANCE, at end of year	$346 123	$287 062

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of accounting

The accounts of the Association are maintained on a cash basis of accounting. Under this method, effect is given only to cash collections and payments. Accordingly, the financial statements do not show accrued income, costs and expenses, and the receivables and payables that would result from such accruals.

Office equipment

The Association charges payments for office equipment (not material in amount) to current operations and shows no equipment in its accounts.

INCOME TAXES

The Association is exempt from federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code and a provision for income taxes is not required.

LEASE

Annual rental of $20,058 is payable for the Association's office premises on a lease expiring June 30, 1977.

Total rent and storage charges were $21,670 for 1976 and $19,999 for 1975.

RETIREMENT PLANS

The association has a retirement plan that covers substantially all full-time employees. Contributions to the plan are based on a percentage of salary for enrolled staff members. Total amounts paid in by the Association were $33,244 and $27,291 for 1976 and 1975, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Our examination of the financial statements included in the preceding section of this report was directed to an expression of our opinion on those statements taken as a whole. The supplemental material presented in the following section of this report has been subjected to certain audit procedures applied in connection with our examination of the financial statements. This information, while not considered necessary for the fair presentation of the statements of assets and liabilities and receipts and disbursements of the Association, is, in our opinion, fairly stated in all material respects when considered in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

Seidman & Seidman

Certified Public Accountants

Washington, D. C.
January 25, 1977

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
SCHEDULE OF DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1976	1975
Board and committee expenses	$ 8 633	$ 7 291
Conference expense	14 785	14 585
Dues	2 401	2 221
Employment fees	1 025	-
Equipment purchases	442	191
Honorarium	2 002	1 024
Hospitalization	1 241	1 308
Insurance and bonding	1 588	1 727
Life insurance	4 102	-
Miscellaneous	488	190
Payroll taxes	5 553	4 620
Periodicals and subscriptions	1 645	884
Printing	8 011	12 242
Professional fees	28 356	28 113
Postage and freight	2 925	2 369
Rent	7 628	7 461
Retirement plan	14 010	10 799
Salaries	107 297	99 795
Staff travel and expenses	8 685	5 030
Stationery and office expenses	4 482	6 804
Telephone	4 563	4 664
Funding for special programs - University Library Management Study Office	22 500	20 000
Totals	$252 362	$231 318

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

SPECIAL PROGRAMS
SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1976	
	Center for Chinese Research Materials	
	Mellon Foundation	(National Endowment for the Humanities - Mellon Foundation)
RECEIPTS:		
Grants	$125 000	$50 000
Convention income	-	
Sale of publications	-	
Transfer from General Operating Fund	-	
Transfer from Chinese Center Revolving Fund	-	
Management Institutes	-	
Film service (net)	-	
Interest income		
Workshops and training programs		
Totals	125 000	50 000
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Allocated administrative fees	15 348	
Consulting fees		465
Convention expenses		
Employee benefits	8 799	4 483
Equipment purchases	1 050	
Miscellaneous		
Office expenses	3 284	634
Payroll taxes	3 540	1 323
Periodicals and subscriptions	101	197
Postage	(16)	(408)
Printing	407	826
Regional workshops (net)		
Rent and storage	5 955	2 916
Salaries and investigator fees	55 388	36 489
Telephone	528	365
Training (net)		
Travel	6 474	1 987
Totals	100 858	49 277
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	24 142	723
PROGRAM BALANCE - BEGINNING	51 959	-0-
	76 101	723
TRANSFERS TO GRANTOR	(76 101)	
PROGRAM BALANCE - ENDING	$ -0-	$ 723

Year ended December 31, 1976					
University Library Management Study Office	Brasenose II Conference	Collection Analysis Program	Power Foundation Program	Total	Year ended December 31, 1975 Total
$ 77 000	$ - -	$110 000	$5 000	$367 000	$249 774
					10 513
26 603				26 603	26 347
22 500				22 500	20 000
					28 934
3 260				3 260	1 710
(824)				(824)	2 788
	161	1 007		1 168	51
5 117				5 117	
133 656	161	111 007	5 000	424 824	340 117
5 000				20 348	25 475
				465	
					36 575
11 304		463		25 049	20 110
1 200				2 250	996
1 802		206		2 008	784
6 579		263		10 760	8 841
3 989				8 852	8 909
1 090				1 388	941
5 555		184		5 315	3 142
20 800		895		22 928	20 696
					401
5 171				14 042	12 538
75 958		2 279		170 114	158 226
4 969		254		6 116	5 266
240				240	1 805
3 968	1 208	251		13 888	10 805
147 625	1 208	4 795	-	303 763	315 510
(13 969)	(1 047)	106 212	5 000	121 061	24 607
8 354	3 799			64 112	39 505
(5 615)	2 752	106 212	5 000	185 173	64 112
				(76 101)	-
$ (5 615)	$2 752	$106 212	$5 000	$109 072	$ 64 112

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

PROOF OF CASH
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1976

CASH BALANCE, beginning	$539 720
ADD - Excess of receipts over (under) disbursements:	
Special programs for which the Association is accountable to the grantors (net of $76,101 grants returned)	44 960
General Operating Fund	2 255
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	2 612
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	59 061
Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1976 paid January 1977	2 226
	650 834
LESS - Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1975 paid January 1976	74
CASH BALANCE, ending	$650 760